DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 525 CE 020 614

TITLE	Status of Vocational Agriculture and the Changing Roles of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in North Carolina. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	North Carolina State Univ., Raleigh. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	North Carolina State Dept. of Public Instruction, Raleigh. Occupational Research Unit.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	132p.; Information in Appendix C may not reproduce well due to small print
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Research; Educational Trends; Job Satisfaction; Professional Recognition; *Program Evaluation; *State Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Role; *Vocational Agriculture; *Vocational Agriculture Teachers
IDENTIFIERS	*North Carolina

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to examine the changing roles of teachers of vocational agriculture and to evaluate the current status of programs as a basis for making recommendations concerning the role of vocational agriculture in public school education during the next decade. Data were collected using a structured interview of 122 North Carolina vocational agriculture teachers. General conclusions drawn from the study include the following: (1) the vocational agriculture teacher in the public schools of North Carolina is generally male, middle-aged, regularly certified, has taught between 15 and 19 years, is satisfied as a vocational agriculture teacher, and plans to leave teaching with 10 years; (2) class size is increasing dramatically with females and urban students accounting for a major portion of the increase; (3) the supervised occupational experience and adult education components of the program are weak; (4) the vocational agriculture teacher is no longer communicating in an organized fashion with the community in the role of interpreter of agricultural education or of changes in agriculture; and (5) teachers want longer contracts, more supervision, more non-school time, more in-service training programs and more time for adult education. (JH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED170525

STATUS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE AND THE CHANGING ROLES OF TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN NORTH CAROLINA

Final Report

1978

Project Director: Dr. Joseph R. Clary
North Carolina State University

Project Associates: Dr. Selz C. Mayo
Dr. Texton R. Miller
Dr. C. Douglas Bryant
North Carolina State University

Dr. A. P. Bell
The A. & T. State University

In Cooperation With

Occupational Research Unit
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

DEPARTMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 020 614

FOREWORD

This project grew out of joint interests and concerns of faculty members in the Agricultural Education Program, Department of Occupational Education, and the Head of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of North Carolina State University at Raleigh, faculty members in the Department of Agricultural Education at the North Carolina A. & T. State University in Greensboro, the State Advisory Committee on Agricultural Education, and the Executive Committee of the North Carolina Occupational Agriculture Teachers Association. It was funded through the Occupational Research Unit, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, State Board of Education, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Appreciation is expressed to all who supported and worked on the project. Among these were: Dr. A. C. Linnerud, Associate Professor, Statistics, North Carolina State University; Mr. Rex A. Buelin, Graduate Research Assistant; interviewers from eight universities in North Carolina; and Miss Marian Eastwood, Secretary, who typed, proofread, kept records, and assisted in other ways.

A very special note of thanks is due to all the vocational agriculture teachers and their principals who participated in the interviews.

This report represents the basic descriptive report of the project. Additional analyses of the data will continue to be made and several subsequent mini-reports are expected to be issued.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Title Page	i
FOREWORD	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
PART I	
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES	2
METHODOLOGY	2
PART II	
PRESENTATION OF DATA	
The Teachers	5
The Principals	18
The Schools	19
The Secondary School Enrollees	21
The Program	24
The Adult Education Role	32
Supervised Occupational Experience and Home Visits	38
Future Farmers of America	43
Community Activities and Change	48
Types of Occupations Entered by Program Graduates	51
PROBLEM AREAS, PROBLEM SOLUTIONS, AND PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS	
Problem Areas and Problem Solutions	52
Program Improvements	58
PART III	
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	
Summary	60
Conclusions	65
APPENDIXES	

LIST OF TABLES

Table Number	Title	Page
1	Number and Percentage of Vocational Agriculture Teachers and Teacher Respondents by Geographic Area, 1977	5
2	Number and Percentage of Teacher Respondents by Race and Geographic Area	6
3	Age Distributions of Teacher Respondents by Geographic Area	6
4	Highest Educational Level of Teacher Respondents by Geographic Area	7
5	Undergraduate Major of Teachers by Geographic Area, Spring, 1977	8
6	Institutions Granting Undergraduate Degrees to Teacher Respondents in the Sample by Geographic Area	8
7	Institutions Granting Graduate Degrees to Teacher Respondents in the Sample by Geographic Area	9
8	Certificate Ratings of Vocational Agriculture Teachers by Geographic Area	10
9	Number of Years as a Vocational Agriculture Teacher by Geographic Area	11
10	Years Teaching Vocational Agriculture in Present School of Teachers by Geographic Area	12
11	Number of Months in 1976-77 School Contracts of Vocational Agriculture Teachers by Geographic Area	12
12	Direction of Changes in Teaching Contracts by Geographic Area, 1971-72 to 1976-77	13
13	Teaching Assignments of Vocational Agriculture Teachers, 1971-72 and 1976-77, by Geographic Area	14
14	Teaching Assignments of Vocational Agriculture Teachers, 1971-72 and 1976-77, by Race	14
15	Time of Day for Leaving School to Work with Adults or to Supervise Occupational Experience Programs by Geographic Area 1976-77	15
16	Time of Day for Leaving School to Work with Adults or to Supervise Occupational Experience Programs by Geographic Area, 1971-72	16
17	Number of Years Teachers Plan to Continue Teaching Vocational Agriculture by Geographic Area	16
18	Reasons Teachers Anticipate Leaving Vocational Agriculture Teaching	17
19	Teacher Ratings of Degree of Satisfaction as a Vocational Agriculture Teacher	17
20	Mean Characteristics of Schools Represented by Teachers in the Sample by Geographic Area	20
21	Percentage Chance of Representation of Various Vocational Education Programs in the Schools by Geographic Area	20
22	Approximate Percentages of Total Male and Female Students Enrolled in a Vocational Education Program by Geographic Area	21
23	Average Number of Vocational Agriculture Enrollees per School by Race and Geographic Area in 1971-72 and 1976-77	21

Table Number	Title	Page
24	Average Number of Vocational Agriculture Enrollees in Each School by Sex and Geographic Area, 1971-72 and 1976-77	22
25	Average Number of Vocational Agriculture Enrollees Per School by Place of Residence, 1971-72 and 1976-77	23
26	Direction of Enrollment Changes in Vocational Agriculture by Geographic Area Between 1971-72 and 1976-77	23
27	Number and Percentage of Vocational Agriculture Offerings by Types of Courses or Course Areas by Geographic Area, 1977	25
28	Composition of Vocational Agriculture Curriculum by Number and Percent of Course Areas Taught by Vocational Agriculture Teachers	25
29	Average Number of Male and Female Enrollees by Course or Course Area	26
30	Rank-Order of Teachers Emphasis Given in Ten Curriculum Areas for 1972 and 1977 by Geographic Area	28
31	Teachers' Perceptions of the Strengths of Vocational Agriculture Components in Their Schools, 1976-77, by Geographic Area	30
32	Teacher Perceptions of Adequacy of Vocational Agriculture Facilities, Equipment, and Instructional Materials, 1976-77	31
33	Number and Percent of Teachers Reporting Having an Advisory Council by Geographic Area, 1977	32
34	Number and Percent of Teachers Reporting a Regularly Organized Adult Education Program in Agriculture by Geographic Area, 1977	33
35	Number and Percent of Teachers by Emphasis Given to Adult Education in 1977 Compared to Five Years Ago (1972) and by Geographic Area, North Carolina, 1977	34
36	Number and Percent of Teachers in Terms of Preference to Giving More Attention to Adult Education, by Geographic Area, North Carolina, 1977	34
37	Voluntary Expressions of Vocational Agriculture Teachers on Local Barriers to More Emphasis on Adult Education, N.C., 1977	35
38	Number and Percent of Teachers Indicating Whether More Emphasis Should be Given Adult Education, by Geographic Area, North Carolina, 1977	36
39	Voluntary Viewpoints of Vocational Agriculture Teachers on General Barriers to More Adult Education, N.C., 1977	36
40	Number and Percent of Teachers Who Think Technical Institutes Have Assumed the Major Responsibilities for Adult Education in Agriculture, by Geographic Area, North Carolina, 1977	37
41	Teacher Visits to Vocational Agriculture Students' Homes, N.C., 1977	38
42	Percentage of Students Receiving Home Visits by Vocational Agriculture Teachers, North Carolina, 1977	39
43	Number and Percentage of Teachers Reporting Mileage Allowance as Adequate for Needed Home Visitations, N.C., 1977	39
44	Teachers' Viewpoints of Principals' Attitudes Toward Home Visits, N.C., 1977	40
45	Teacher Emphasis on Supervised Occupational Experience Program (S.O.E.), N.C., 1977	40
46	Number and Percentage of Students Having Supervised Occupational Experience Program by Grade Level, N.C., 1977	41

Table Number	Title	Page
47	Teachers Report of Student Opportunities for S.O.E. in 1977 Compared to 1972	42
48	Plans of Vocational Agriculture Teachers for Future Emphasis to S.O.E. Programs, N.C., 1977	42
49	Teacher Viewpoints of the Strengths of the Supervised Occupational Experience Programs in Their Schools, N.C., 1977	42
50	Status of F.F.A. Chapters, 1977 and Number and Percentage of Vocational Agriculture Enrollees in Membership, 1972 and 1977	43
51	Viewpoints of Teachers Toward F.F.A. Program	44
52	Teacher Viewpoints of the Strength of F.F.A. Programs, N.C.	44
53	Meeting Times for F.F.A. Chapters, N.C., 1977	45
54	Future Emphasis Upon F.F.A. Program, N.C., 1977	45
55	F.F.A. Chapter Participation in State Level Activities During 1975-76 School Year	46
56	F.F.A. Chapter Participation in Proficiency Awards and in Written Programs of Activities, N.C., 1977	46
57	Viewpoints of Teachers Toward F.F.A. Alumni Chapters, 1976-77	47
58	Teacher Perception of the Change in Prestige of the Position of Teacher of Vocational Agriculture Between 1972 and 1977	48
59	Teacher Perception of Changes in Morale Between 1972 and 1977	49
60	Changes in In-School Responsibilities of a Non-Vocational Agriculture Nature Between 1972 and 1977	49
61	Number and Percent of Teachers Who Would Recommend Teaching Vocational Agriculture to One of More Students	50
62	Teachers' Rank Order of Moderate-to-Serious Problem Areas in Vocational Agriculture, Local and Statewide, by Geographic Area, 1977	53
63	Principals' Rank Order of Moderate-to-Serious Problem Areas in Vocational Agriculture, Local and Statewide, by Geographic Area, N.C., 1977	55
64	A Rank-Order Comparison of the Teachers vs. Principals Viewpoints of Moderate-to-Serious Problem Areas, Local and Statewide, N.C., 1977	57
65	Teachers' Selections of Three Most Serious Barriers to Further Improvement of the Vocational Agriculture Program, N.C., 1977	58

STATUS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE AND THE CHANGING ROLES OF THE TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN NORTH CAROLINA

PART I

Introduction

During the Spring of 1975, the Executive Committee of the North Carolina Occupational Agriculture Teachers Association, the Agricultural Education Program Unit of the Department of Occupational Education at North Carolina State University, and the Head of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at North Carolina State University conducted a pilot study to examine the changing roles of teachers of vocational agriculture during the previous five year period. The study included 18 teachers in 18 schools located in 14 counties. The schools were selected on a cluster, random sample basis. A structured interview technique was used to secure data from both teachers and principals.

Some key findings from that pilot study were:

(1) Over 70 percent of the man years of teaching were being given to only four courses.

(2) Course offerings and materials had improved in quality during the five year period.

(3) Teachers were responsible for either 5 or 6 high school classes each day along with other responsibilities.

(4) Teachers were giving less emphasis to F.F.A. than they had given five years ago.

(5) Both home visits and supervised practice were receiving less emphasis than in previous years.

(6) Only about 1/2 of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture courses during the 1974-75 school year had a supervised occupational experience program.

(7) There was no regularly organized adult education program conducted in two-thirds of the schools included in the pilot study.

(8) The vocational agriculture teacher was no longer communicating in an organized fashion with the community in either the role of interpreter of agricultural education or in terms of changes in agriculture.

(9) Over one-half the teachers thought the prestige of the position of vocational agriculture teacher had decreased.

(10) Over 70 percent thought that morale of teachers had been getting poorer.

Since there was no probability sample involved in the pilot study, no generalizations beyond the 18 cases could be made. Also, the limited number of cases in the pilot study sample precluded any sophisticated statistical analysis of the data.

These pilot study findings raised several questions. Are the trends identified in the pilot study representative of the whole State? What is the current status of programs? What factors are influencing the trends? What needs to be done to improve programs and program results?

Since it was felt that these and similar questions could be answered only through a carefully designed statewide study, a proposal for such a study was developed. It was encouraged and endorsed by the North Carolina Occupational Agriculture Teachers Association and the State Advisory Committee on Agricultural Education and funded by the State Board of Education.

Purpose and Objectives

Purpose:

The major purpose of the study was to examine the changing roles of teachers of vocational agriculture and to evaluate the current status of programs as a basis for making recommendations concerning the role of vocational agriculture in public school education during the next decade.

Objectives:

The major objectives guiding the direction and thrust of the study were:

(1) To identify, document, and analyze trends in vocational agriculture education in North Carolina: major components of programs (classroom and laboratory instruction, Future Farmers of America, supervised occupational experience, adult education), roles of teachers, types of students (e.g. sex, race, farm - non-farm), instructional emphases, and program results.

(2) To identify and document problem areas in current vocational agriculture programs.

(3) To establish the current picture and a data base for future studies by documenting the present status of vocational agriculture education in the State: number of students; types of students; types of programs; characteristics of programs; characteristics of teachers; status of facilities, equipment and instructional materials.

(4) To evaluate program results in terms of types of occupations program graduates enter and leadership roles played by graduates (NOTE: a descriptive analysis rather than a major follow-up study).

(5) To examine the changing leadership roles in the local community of teachers of vocational agriculture.

(6) To generate possible solutions to the problems identified in Objective 2.

Methodology

The general methodology employed was a structured interview of vocational agriculture teachers and administrators in schools selected through a random sampling procedure. An instrument containing the questions and room to record responses was developed along with an interview guide to assist the interviewers. A copy of the data collection instrument is included in this report as Appendix B. A copy of the interview guide is included as Appendix C.

A random sample of the vocational agriculture teachers, stratified by Mountain, Piedmont, and Coastal Plains Regions, was drawn. A total of 127 teachers were selected which was between 1/4 and 1/3 of the potential total population.

Interviewers (juniors, seniors, and/or graduate students) were selected from eight universities across the State. They were trained in special sessions, and hired to do the actual interviewing. The universities involved were: Western Carolina University, Appalachian State University, A. & T. State University, UNC-Charlotte, North Carolina State University, Pembroke State University, East Carolina University and Elizabeth City State University. A list of the interviewers and the institutions represented is shown in Appendix D.

Arranging the appointments for the interviews was done by the Project Staff. Telephone calls were made to the teachers, asking them to agree to participate, to schedule at least a two hour block of time with the interviewer, to prepare certain information in advance for the interviewer and to arrange a 30 minute period of interview time with the principal. Coordination of the appointments around the teacher's time and with the interviewer's availability and getting notifications and verifications of these and other information out was handled in the office of the Project Director.

Upon calling, it was found that three of the teachers in the sample were no longer teaching. With a potential base of 124, all 124 initially agreed to the interviews. Two later withdrew - which left a 98.4 percent response.

The high rate of response was attributed to:

(1) The pilot study.

(2) Reporting the results of the pilot study at the Annual Teachers Conference.

(3) Involvement of the North Carolina Occupational Agriculture Teachers Association and the State Advisory Committee on Agricultural Education.

(4) Information about the study in the Teachers Association newsletter.

(5) Concern on the part of the teachers regarding changes taking place and the need to document these changes.

(6) The personal telephone calls to the teachers from the project staff.

In the study, an effort was made to get at:

(1) Characteristics of the teacher.

(2) Characteristics of the present course structure and enrollees.

(3) Evaluation of the component parts of the program.

(4) Status of facilities, equipment, and instructional materials.

(5) Efforts in adult education and changes over a five year period.

(6) Efforts with FFA and changes.

(7) Efforts in Supervised Occupational Experience and changes.

(8) Community Activities and change.

(9) Instructional emphases and how these have changed over five years.

(10) Identification of problems to a good vocational agriculture program (both local and statewide) and suggestions for solving these problems.

(11) Characteristics of the principal, the school, and the principal's perceptions of the vocational agriculture program, the problems and the solutions to these problems.

PART II

Presentation of Data

The Teachers

Nearly one-half the vocational agriculture teacher respondents were located in the Coastal Plains Region of the State, just over one-third in the Piedmont Region and slightly fewer than one-fifth in the Mountain Region (See Table 1). Since the geographic distribution of the population of the State in the three regions differs considerably from these proportions, especially the Piedmont and Coastal Plains, the teacher distribution appears more related to the geographic emphasis on agricultural production.

Table 1. Number and Percentage of Vocational Agriculture Teachers and Teacher Respondents by Geographic Area, 1977

Geographic Area	Vocational Agriculture Teachers		Teacher Respondents	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	77	17.30	21	17.21
Piedmont	164	36.85	46	37.70
Coastal Plains	204	45.84	55	45.08
State Totals:	445	99.99	122	99.99

The sample was drawn in such a way as to be proportional by geographic area and contained 28.54 percent of the vocational agriculture teachers listed in the 1976-77 directory of teachers prepared in the State Department of Public Instruction. That directory listed the names of 455 vocational agriculture teachers along with their addresses and schools in which they taught. The three major geographic areas of the State (Mountains with 25 counties, Piedmont with 34 counties, and Coastal Plains with 41 counties) were used as a basis for certain comparisons of the data. The respondents represent 27.42 percent of the total number of teachers.

Sex. Ninety-eight percent of the teacher respondents in the study were male and two percent female. The female teachers were located in the Piedmont. In that area, 96 percent of the teachers were male and 4 percent female. In the other two areas, all teachers in the sample were male.

In the sample, 30 percent of the teacher respondents were black with nearly three-fourths located in the Coastal Plains and almost one-fourth in the Piedmont. Only one teacher in the sample from the Mountains area was black. (See Table 2)

Table 2. Number and Percentage of Teacher Respondents by Race and Geographic Area

Geographic Area	Teachers by Race					
	Black		Indian		White	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	1	4.76	0	0	20	95.24
Piedmont	9	19.57	0	0	37	80.43
Coastal Plains	27	49.09	1	1.82	27	49.09
STATE TOTALS	37	30.33	1	.82	84	68.85

The Mountain area sample had nearly five percent of its teachers who were black, the Piedmont area sample almost 20 percent, and the Coastal Plains area sample had approximately 50 percent.

Overall, slightly over two-thirds of the teacher respondents were white, slightly under one-third were black, and less than one percent were Indian.

Age. Table 3 shows the age distributions of the teacher respondents by geographic area and for the State as a whole.

Table 3. Age Distributions of Teacher Respondents by Geographic Area

Age Distributions	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						STATE TOTALS	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
30 or less	1	4.76	10	23.26	8	14.81	19	16.10
31-40	6	28.57	9	20.93	11	20.37	26	22.03
41-50	9	42.86	8	18.60	13	24.07	30	25.42
51-60	5	23.81	13	30.23	19	35.19	37	31.36
61+	0	0.00	3	6.98	3	5.56	6	5.08
TOTALS:	21	100.00	43	100.00	54	100.00	118	100.00

The Piedmont area had the highest percentage of teachers who were 30 years of age or less, the Mountain area had the highest percentage between 31 and 50 years of age, and the Coastal Plains area had the highest percentage 51 years of age and over.

A further analysis of the data revealed the average age of teachers by area and for the State was as follows:

Geographic Area	Mean Age of Teachers
Mountains	44.10
Piedmont	43.07
Coastal Plains	44.70
STATE AVERAGE:	44.00

The average age of teachers in the sample was exactly 44. There was practically no difference in the average age of the teachers by geographic area of the State.

Educational Level. Over 95 percent of the teacher respondents had at least a baccalaureate degree (See Table 4).

Table 4. Highest Educational Level of Teacher Respondents by Geographic Area

Level of Education	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						STATE TOTALS	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Associate Degree	0	0.00	2	4.35	4	7.27	6	4.92
Bachelors Degree	14	66.67	24	52.17	29	52.73	67	54.92
Masters Degree	7	33.33	19	41.30	22	40.00	48	39.34
Doctoral Degree	0	0.00	1	2.17	0	0.00	1	.82
TOTALS:	21	100.00	46	99.99	55	100.00	122	100.00

Teachers in the Piedmont and Coastal Plains had higher average educational levels than teachers in the Mountain area. The higher levels likely reflect the proximity of the two higher education institutions offering graduate degrees in agricultural education. One is located in the approximate center of the Piedmont area while the other is on the far eastern edge of the Piedmont - just west of the Coastal Plains.

Undergraduate Major. Until the late 1960's or early 1970's, almost 100 percent of the vocational agriculture teachers in the State had baccalaureate degrees in agricultural education. The teacher shortage in this field caused the North Carolina State Board of Education to allow non-Agricultural Education graduates to become employed as teachers of vocational agriculture.

This move resulted in over 10 percent, or approximately 73, of the State's vocational agriculture teachers in 1977 without baccalaureate degrees in Agricultural Education.

Table 5 pictures the situation regarding the undergraduate majors of the sample of vocational agriculture teachers in Spring, 1977.

Table 5. Undergraduate Major of Teachers by Geographic Area, Spring, 1977

Undergraduate Major	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						STATE TOTALS	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agri. Education	18	85.71	35	76.09	49	89.09	102	83.61
Tech. Agriculture	1	4.76	4	8.70	3	5.45	8	6.56
Forestry	0	0.00	1	2.17	0	0.00	1	0.82
Other	2	9.52	6	13.04	3	5.45	11	9.02
TOTALS:	21	99.99	46	100.00	55	99.99	122	100.00

One-sixth of the vocational agriculture teachers in the sample did not prepare to teach vocational agriculture as an undergraduate in college. Almost one-fourth of the teachers in the Piedmont had baccalaureate degrees other than in Agricultural Education, while only eleven percent of the Coastal Plains teachers had non-agricultural education baccalaureate degrees.

Almost one-tenth of the teachers in the sample had undergraduate degrees in areas other than either agricultural education, technical agriculture, or forestry.

Four-fifths of the State's vocational agriculture teachers in 1976-77 received undergraduate degrees from either North Carolina A. & T. State University or North Carolina State University. (Table 6).

Table 6. Institutions Granting Undergraduate Degrees to Teacher Respondents in the Sample by Geographic Area

Institutions Granting Degrees	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						STATE TOTALS	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
N.C. A & T[a]	1	4.76	6	13.04	22	40.00	29	23.77
N.C.S.U.[b]	12	57.14	33	71.74	23	41.82	68	55.74
Other	8	38.10	5	10.87	7	12.73	20	16.39
No Response	0	0.00	2	4.35	3	5.45	5	4.10
TOTALS:	21	100.00	46	100.00	55	100.00	122	100.00

[a] North Carolina A. & T. State University, Greensboro

[b] North Carolina State University at Raleigh

Almost one-fourth of the teachers had received undergraduate degrees from the North Carolina A. & T. State University located in Greensboro. Just over three-fourths of these were teaching in the Coastal Plains.

Over one-half the teachers received undergraduate degrees from North Carolina State University at Raleigh. Of the North Carolina State graduates, one-half were teaching in the Piedmont, one-third were in the Coastal Plains and the remaining one-sixth were in the mountains.

North Carolina A. & T. State University and North Carolina State University had an almost equal number of graduates teaching in the Coastal Plains.

Over one-third of the teachers in the Mountains apparently received undergraduate degrees from out-of-state institutions.

Graduate Major. Fifty-two, or 43.70 percent, of the teachers in the sample indicated they held masters degrees. Forty-four, or 84.62 percent, of these were in agricultural education. Eight, or 15.38 percent, had graduate degrees in other fields.

Only one of the teachers held a sixth-year certificate and this was neither in agricultural education, technical agriculture, nor forestry.

Two teachers held doctoral degrees. One of these teachers was located in the Piedmont and the degree was in forestry. The other teacher was located in the Coastal Plains and the degree was in a field other than agricultural education, technical agriculture, or forestry.

Table 7 shows the institutions granting graduate degrees to the teacher respondents by geographic area.

Table 7. Institutions Granting Graduate Degrees to Teacher Respondents in the Sample by Geographic Area

Institutions Granting Degrees	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						STATE TOTALS	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
N.C. A & T [a]	0	0.00	2	9.09	9	39.13	11	21.15
N.C.S.U. [b]	5	71.43	14	63.64	8	34.78	27	51.92
Other	2	28.57	3	13.64	2	8.70	7	13.46
No Response	0	0.00	3	13.64	4	17.39	7	13.46
TOTALS:	7	100.00	22	100.00	23	100.00	52	99.99

[a] North Carolina A. & T. State University, Greensboro

[b] North Carolina State University at Raleigh

The Coastal Plains had slightly more teachers with graduate degrees from the North Carolina A. & T. State University than from North Carolina State University. Both the Mountains and Piedmont had more teachers with graduate degrees from North Carolina State University.

Certificate Ratings. Vocational agriculture teachers are certified by the State Board of Education. Certificate ratings for the responding teachers by geographic area are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Certificate Ratings of Vocational Agriculture Teachers by Geographic Area

Certificate Ratings	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						STATE TOTALS	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Regular "A"	3	14.29	9	23.08	14	28.57	26	23.85
Vocational "A"	11	52.38	13	33.33	20	40.82	44	40.37
Provisional "A"	0	0.00	2	5.13	1	2.04	3	2.75
Regular "G"	7	33.33	14	35.90	14	28.57	35	32.11
Unsure	0	0.00	1	2.56	0	0.00	1	0.92
TOTALS:	21	100.00	39	100.00	49	100.00	109	100.00

Only three teachers in the sample who provided information on their certificate ratings indicated they were on "provisional" certification. Thus, nearly all teachers were fully certified through the regular route of a degree in agricultural education or by taking sufficient hours above the "bachelors degree in another field" to remove the "provisional" status.

Approximately one-third of the teachers indicated that they had graduate level certification. The reader may note a slight discrepancy between data in Table 8 and the expected data, given the fact that nearly 40 percent of the teachers indicated that they held master's degrees (See Table 4). The number of "No Responses" to the certification question partially accounts for this.

The highest percentage of teachers with graduate level certificates were in the Piedmont with the next highest percentage in the Mountains and the lowest percentage in the Coastal Plains.

Work Experience. Thirty-one teacher respondents in the sample indicated that they had one or more years working in non-agriculture related jobs after completion of the baccalaureate degree. Eight of these were in the Mountains, 14 in the Piedmont, and 9 in the Coastal Plains. The range of non-agriculture job experience for teachers in the Mountains was 1-8 years with a mean of 3.38 years. For teachers in the Piedmont the range was 1-10 years with a mean of 3.07 years. The range for Coastal Plains teachers was 1-5 years with a mean of 2.89 years.

Thirty-seven teachers had worked in agriculture related jobs that were non-school connected. Seven of these were in the Mountains, 17 in the Piedmont, and 13 in the Coastal Plains. The range for teachers located in the Mountains was 1-11 years and the mean was 2.86 years. For teachers in the Piedmont, the range was 1-18 years with a mean of 4.88 years. The range for Coastal Plains teachers was 1-22 years and the mean was 7.77 years.

Nearly one-sixth of the teachers had teaching experience other than in vocational agriculture. These were distributed fairly proportionately over the three geographic areas. The range for the entire group was 1-10 years and the mean was 3.76 years.

Over one-third of the vocational agriculture teachers in the State had taught 10 or fewer years (Table 9). The percentage range in this category, by geographic area, was from a low of 28.57 percent in the Mountains to a high of 43.48 percent in the Piedmont.

Table 9. Number of Years as a Vocational Agriculture Teacher By Geographic Area

Years Teaching Vocational Agri:	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						STATE TOTALS	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1-10	6	28.57	20	43.48	16	29.09	42	34.43
11-20	7	33.33	9	19.57	15	27.27	31	25.41
21-30	7	33.33	12	26.09	14	25.45	33	27.05
31-40	1	4.76	5	10.87	10	18.18	16	13.11
TOTALS:	21	99.99	46	100.01	55	99.99	122	100.00

The data in Table 9 would suggest that teachers in the Piedmont had fewer average years of teaching experience followed by teachers in the Mountains. Teachers in the Coastal Plains had the highest mean years of teaching experience. The mean years of teaching experience for Mountains was 17.00, for Piedmont teachers 15.80, and for Coastal Plains teachers 18.36. For the State, the mean years of vocational agriculture teaching experience was 17.16.

The total number of years experience as a vocational agriculture teacher in the school of present assignment for the sample of teachers is shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Years Teaching Vocational Agriculture in Present School of Teachers by Geographic Area

Years in Present School[a]	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						STATE TOTALS	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1-5	4	19.05	14	30.43	14	26.42	32	26.67
6-10	6	28.57	13	28.26	16	30.19	35	29.17
11-20	6	28.57	9	19.57	6	11.32	21	17.50
21-30	5	23.81	9	19.57	14	26.42	28	23.33
31 and over	0	0.00	1	2.17	3	5.66	4	3.33
TOTALS:	21	100.00	46	100.00	53	100.01	120	100.00

[a] Note that the categories are not even.

The vocational agriculture teachers in the Piedmont had fewer years of teaching in their present school than did teachers in the other two geographic areas. The Coastal Plains had the highest percentage of teachers with 21 or more years teaching vocational agriculture in the present school. The average tenure for teaching vocational agriculture in the present school statewide was 12.84 years. For the Mountains the average was 13.10 years; for the Piedmont it was 11.57 years; and for the Coastal Plains 13.85 years.

Months in Contract. The number of months in the annual contracts of the vocational agriculture teachers in the sample for 1976-77 ranged from 10.00 through 12.00. These are shown in Table 11 by geographic area of the State.

Table 11. Number of Months in 1976-77 School Contracts of Vocational Agriculture Teachers by Geographic Area

Months in Annual Contract	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						STATE TOTALS	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
10.00	0	0.00	9	19.57	10	18.18	19	15.57
10.50	0	0.00	2	4.35	2	3.64	4	3.28
11.00	2	9.52	1	2.17	5	9.09	8	6.56
11.50	0	0.00	1	2.17	0	0.00	1	0.82
12.00	19	90.48	33	71.74	38	69.09	90	73.77
TOTALS:	21	100.00	46	100.00	55	100.00	122	100.00

Over one-fourth of the teachers, statewide, had annual contracts of less than 12 months. The Mountains had the highest percentage of teachers with 12 months contracts while the Coastal Plains had the lowest.

The statewide mean annual contract length was 11.57 months. For the Mountains the mean was 11.90 months, for the Piedmont 11.51 months, and for the Coastal Plains 11.49 months.

Changes in Length of Contract Over Five Year Period. Teachers were asked to compare the number of months in their teaching contracts in 1976-77 with the length of teaching contract five years previous and to indicate the direction of change. Table 12 shows the direction of changes indicated by percentage of teachers responding to each direction by geographic area.

Table 12. Direction of Changes in Teaching Contracts by Geographic Area, 1971-72 to 1976-77

Months in Contract	GEOGRAPHIC AREA			Statewide Average
	Mountains	Piedmont	Coastal Plains	
	% of Respondents	% of Respondents	% of Respondents	% of Respondents
Same	94	70	82	80
More	0	18	0	6
Fewer	6	12	16	14

The length of annual teaching contract in months for four-fifths of the teachers did not change over the five year period. For some teachers in the Piedmont the length of contract was increased. A larger percentage of teachers in the Coastal Plains had annual contract length reduced than in either of the other two geographic areas.

Teachers who lost contract months mentioned two factors by way of explanation: (1) de-emphasis by local administration, and (2) moving man-months to other forms of vocational education.

Teaching Assignments 1971-72 and 1976-77. Teachers in the sample were asked to indicate their teaching assignments for 1976-77 and (for those who were also teaching) in 1971-72. Table 13 summarizes those responses.

According to Table 13, a smaller percentage of the teachers in the sample taught exploratory or introductory level courses only in 1976-77 than was the case in 1971-72. The percentage of teachers working with students in grades 10-12 only increased over the five year period while the percentage of teachers whose assignments cut across both introductory (grade 9) and advanced (grades 10-12) areas remained about the same.

Table 13. Teaching Assignments of Vocational Agriculture Teachers, 1971-72 and 1976-77, by Geographic Area

Teaching Assignment	Geographic Area: Mountains 1971-72 #	%	Mountains 1976-77 #	%	Piedmont 1971-72 #	%	Piedmont 1976-77 #	%	Coastal Plains 1971-72 #	%	Coastal Plains 1976-77 #	%	STATEWIDE AVERAGE 1971-72 #	%	STATEWIDE AVERAGE 1976-77 #	%
Grades 7-9 Only	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	11.43	2	4.35	4	9.30	4	7.27	8	8.33	6	4.92
Grades 10-12 Only	8	44.44	10	47.62	18	51.43	23	50.00	21	48.84	33	60.00	47	48.96	66	54.10
Cut Across Both Levels	10	55.56	11	52.38	12	34.29	21	45.65	17	39.53	18	32.73	39	40.63	50	40.98
No Response	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.86	0	0.00	1	2.33	0	0.00	2	2.08	0	0.00
TOTALS:	18	100.00	21	100.00	35	100.01	46	100.00	43	100.00	55	100.00	96	100.00	122	100.00

Few major changes in teaching assignments took place in the Mountains during the five-year period. However, the percentage of Piedmont teachers teaching only introductory and exploratory courses (grades 7-9) decreased. those teaching only advanced courses (grades 10-12) remained about the same, and those cutting across both areas increased. For Coastal Plains teachers, the percentage teaching only grades 7-9 decreased slightly, those teaching only grades 10-12 increased considerably, and those cutting across both areas remained about the same.

Teaching Assignments 1971-72 and 1976-77 by Race. Table 14 shows the teaching assignments of teachers in the sample for 1971-72 and 1976-77 by race.

Table 14. Teaching Assignments of Vocational Agriculture Teachers, 1971-72 and 1976-77 by Race

Teaching Assignment	Race: Black 1971-72 #	%	Black 1976-77 #	%	Indian 1971-72 #	%	Indian 1976-77 #	%	White 1971-72 #	%	White 1976-77 #	%
Grades 7-9 Only	5	14.71	4	10.81	0	0	0	0	2	2.98	2	2.38
Grades 10-12 Only	11	32.35	14	37.84	0	0	0	0	39	58.21	50	59.52
Cut Across Both Levels	18	52.94	19	51.35	1	100.00	1	100.00	26	38.81	32	38.10
Totals:	34	100.00	37	100.00	1	100.00	1	100.00	67	100.00	84	100.00

Teaching assignments by race changed little during the five year period. A higher percentage of black teachers had teaching assignments in grades 7-9 only and cutting across both grades 7-9 and 10-12. A higher percentage of white teachers taught in grades 10-12 only.

Time Available to Work with Adults or Supervise Occupational Experience Program.

Teachers were requested to indicate the time of day they were free to leave the school to work with adults or supervise the students' occupational experience programs, etc. The data in Table 15 reveal that two-thirds of the teachers in 1976-77 were in school all day, leaving little time for working with adults or supervising the occupational experience programs of their students.

Table 15. Time of Day for Leaving School to Work with Adults or to Supervise Occupational Experience Programs by Geographic Area, 1976-77

Time Free to Leave School	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						STATE TOTALS	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Before 2:00 p.m.	1	5.00	2	4.54	1	2.17	4	3.64
2:00 p.m.	4	20.00	11	25.00	14	30.43	29	26.36
2:30 p.m.	0	0.0	2	4.55	2	4.35	4	3.64
3:00 p.m.	7	35.00	14	31.82	11	23.91	32	29.09
3:30 p.m.	4	20.00	11	25.00	12	26.09	27	24.55
4:00 p.m.	4	20.00	4	9.09	6	13.04	14	12.73
TOTALS:	20	100.00	44	100.00	46	99.99	110	100.01

Two-thirds of the respondents indicated their inability to leave school prior to 3:00 p.m. each day in order to work with adults or to supervise the occupational experience programs of students. Fewer than one-third were able to leave by 2:00 p.m.

On the average, teachers in the Coastal Plains were free to leave school earlier than those in the Piedmont or Mountains. Three-fourths of the Mountain teachers had duties at the schools until 3:00 p.m. or after.

Table 16 shows responses to a similar question about the time teachers were free to leave school for these purposes five years ago. Eighty-seven teachers responded to this question.

In 1971-72 almost one-half (44.83%) of the teachers statewide were able to leave school by 2:00 p.m. to work with adults or to supervise the occupational experience programs of students. In 1976-77, this was reduced to fewer than one-third (30.00%) of the teachers.

When comparing Tables 15 and 16, teachers statewide were clearly having to remain at school longer in 1976-77 than in 1971-72. The greatest impact of these changes occurred in the Coastal Plains and Piedmont areas of the state.

Table 16. Time of Day for Leaving School to Work with Adults or to Supervise Occupational Experience Programs by Geographic Area, 1971-72

Time Free to Leave School	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						STATE TOTALS	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Before 2:00 p.m.	0	0.00	6	18.18	6	15.38	12	13.80
2:00 p.m.	5	33.33	10	30.30	12	30.77	27	31.03
2:30 p.m.	0	0.00	1	3.03	2	5.13	3	3.45
3:00 p.m.	5	33.33	10	30.30	10	25.64	25	28.74
3:30 p.m.	4	26.67	4	12.12	6	15.38	14	16.09
4:00 p.m.	1	6.67	2	6.06	3	7.69	6	6.90
TOTALS:	15	100.00	33	99.99	39	99.99	87	100.00

Years Planning to Continue Teaching Vocational Agriculture. Teachers in the sample were asked to indicate the number of years they planned to continue teaching vocational agriculture and the responses indicated a need for a large number of replacements by 1982 (Table 17).

Table 17. Number of Years Teachers Plan to Continue Teaching Vocational Agriculture by Geographic Area

Years To Continue Teaching	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						STATE TOTALS	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-5	5	23.81	16	37.21	17	34.69	38	33.63
6-10	4	19.05	7	16.28	12	24.49	23	20.36
11-15	4	19.05	8	18.60	7	14.29	19	16.81
16-20	5	23.81	7	16.28	4	8.16	16	14.16
21 and over	3	14.29	5	11.63	9	18.37	17	15.04
TOTALS:	21	100.01	43	100.00	49	100.00	113	100.00

One-third of the teachers indicated that they planned to leave teaching within five years. Over half the teachers did not plan to continue teaching beyond ten years. Seventy percent expected to have left teaching within 15 years.

Reasons Teachers Anticipate Leaving. Teachers who planned to continue teaching for 15 or fewer years were asked to give the reason why they anticipated leaving the teaching of vocational agriculture. Table 18 shows the reasons given by teachers according to geographic area. The data indicate that almost all teachers, rather than only those expected to leave within 15 years, responded to the question of why they would leave teaching.

Over one-half the teachers gave "retirement" as the reason for leaving teaching within 15 years. Nearly 10 percent indicated they would enter farming or a non-school agricultural occupation.

Table 18. Reasons Teachers Anticipate Leaving Vocational Agriculture Teaching

Reasons for Leaving	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						STATEWIDE TOTALS	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Retirement	11	55.00	21	46.67	29	63.04	61	54.95
Move to School Administration	0	0.00	3	6.67	2	4.35	5	4.50
Enter non-school agri. occupation	0	0.00	4	8.89	3	6.52	7	6.31
Go into farming	2	10.00	0	0.00	1	2.17	3	2.70
Enter non-agri. occupation	0	0.00	2	4.44	3	6.52	5	4.50
Other	7	35.00	15	33.33	8	17.39	30	27.03
TOTALS:	20	100.00	45	100.00	46	99.99	111	99.99

Satisfaction as a Vocational Agriculture Teacher. Teachers were requested to rate their present (1976-77 school year) degree of satisfaction as a vocational agriculture teacher. Response choices ranged from "highly satisfied" to "highly dissatisfied." Their responses by geographic area are presented in Table 19.

Table 19. Teacher Ratings of Degree of Satisfaction as a Vocational Agriculture Teacher

Satisfaction Ratings	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						STATE TOTALS	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Highly Satisfied	7	33.33	16	34.78	19	34.55	42	34.43
Satisfied	12	57.14	24	52.17	29	52.73	65	53.28
Neutral	2	9.52	3	6.52	4	7.27	9	7.38
Somewhat Dissatisfied	0	0.00	3	6.52	3	5.45	6	4.92
Highly Dissatisfied	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTALS:	21	99.99	46	99.99	55	100.00	122	100.01

Seven-eighths of the vocational agriculture teachers indicated they were either satisfied or highly satisfied as a teacher. One-eighth of the teachers appeared "neutral" or "somewhat dissatisfied." No teachers indicated that they were "highly dissatisfied" as teachers. No teachers from the Mountain area expressed dissatisfaction with teaching.

Number of Vocational Agriculture Teachers in Departments of Respondents. The range and mean number of vocational agriculture teachers in departments represented by the respondents and the percentages of respondents in various size departments are shown below by geographic area and statewide:

Vocational Agriculture Teachers in North Carolina in Departments of Respondents, 1977	Geographic Area			
Total Number of Teachers:	Mountains 77	Piedmont 164	Coastal Plains 204	Statewide 445
Respondents				
Number of Respondents	21	46	55	122
Range in Teacher Numbers	1-3	1-3	1-5	1-5
Mean Number of Teachers	1.76	1.77	2.13	1.93
Percentage of Respondents in Various Size Departments				
One Teacher	38.10	36.96	47.27	40.98
Two Teachers	52.38	56.52	23.64	41.80
Three Teachers	9.52	6.52	21.82	13.93
Four Teachers	0.00	0.00	3.64	1.64
Five Teachers	0.00	0.00	3.64	1.64

The Principals

Data were secured from principals of the schools in which 115 of the vocational agriculture teachers in the sample were located. The reader should note that this does not represent 115 separate school principals since more than one teacher in some schools was selected as part of the sample.

Sex. Practically all principals were male. The only female principal interviewed was in the Coastal Plains.

Race. Statewide, 6 percent of the principals were black, 2 percent were Indian, and 92 percent were white. Six of the seven black principals and both of the Indian principals interviewed were from the Coastal Plains. The other black principal was from the Piedmont.

Age. The average age of the principals statewide was 44 years. The average age of principals in the Mountains was 44. In the Piedmont and Coastal Plains the average ages were 46 and 44 respectively.

Education. Ninety-nine percent of the principals interviewed had earned a graduate degree. Seventy percent indicated a masters degree as the highest degree earned, twenty-four percent indicated the Sixth-Year Certificate and four percent had earned the doctorate. The Sixth-Year Certificate was held by forty-two percent of the Piedmont area principals, by twenty-nine percent of the Mountain principals, and by only five percent of the Coastal Plains principals. Three principals in the Coastal Plains held doctorates and one from the Mountains had a doctoral degree.

Just over one-half of the undergraduate degrees were earned in a teaching field. The highest percentage of baccalaureates Statewide (26%) was awarded by East Carolina University. Appalachian State University had awarded 16 percent of the undergraduate degrees and Western Carolina University and University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill each had awarded 6 percent. Seventeen percent had undergraduate degrees from private institutions and 14 percent had them from other public institutions in the State. Out-of-State institutions and blank responses accounted for the other 15 percent. Mountain principals had more likely received undergraduate degrees from Appalachian State University followed by Western Carolina University, Piedmont principals from Appalachian State University and a tie for second place between East Carolina University and University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill, and Coastal Plains principals from East Carolina University.

East Carolina University, Appalachian State University, and University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill were the institutions from which the responding principals were most likely to have earned masters degrees or sixth-year certificates. Again, geographic area variations were noted. Those principals of Mountain schools were likely to have earned graduate degrees or certificates from Appalachian State University; those principals from the Piedmont were likely to have earned them from University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill; those from the Coastal Plains likely earned them at East Carolina University.

Work Experience. Principals averaged less than one year of work experience not in a school setting after completing their undergraduate degrees. They had averaged 13.2 years of teaching experience, 1.2 years in school but in non-teaching and non-principal work, and 6.6 years as principal at their present school assignment. The geographic area variations in the above averages were very minor.

The Schools

Table 20 summarizes the mean characteristics of the schools by geographic area. The mean number of grades per school was slightly less than five. Total enrollments per school on a statewide basis were fewer than one thousand, however for the Piedmont, enrollments averaged over one thousand. The average school had fewer than 50 full-time teachers. Schools in the Coastal Plains were more likely to use part-time teachers.

Table 20. Mean Characteristics of Schools Represented by Teachers in the Sample by Geographic Area

School Characteristics	GEOGRAPHIC AREA			STATE AVERAGE
	Mountains	Piedmont	Coastal Plains	
Number of Grades Represented	4.04	4.65	4.96	4.67
Total School Enrollment	866	1024	897	939
Total Enrollment-Grades 9,10, 11 and/or 12	846	932	795	857
Number Full-Time Teachers	42	49	45	46
Number Part-Time Teachers	1.2	2	7	4

Vocational agriculture was taught in rather large schools but with an average of fewer than five grades in the school. The larger schools were more likely to be located in the Piedmont with smaller ones in the Mountains. Schools in the Coastal Plains had a larger average number of grades in the schools than did either the Piedmont or Mountains.

Vocational Education Programs. Table 21 shows the percentage chance that a particular vocational education program would be represented in the schools.

Table 21. Percentage Chance of Representation of Various Vocational Education Programs in the Schools by Geographic Area

Vocational Education Programs	GEOGRAPHIC AREA			STATE AVERAGE
	Mountains	Piedmont	Coastal Plains	
Agriculture	100	100	100	100
Business and/or Office (Vocation)	90	81	82	83
Distributive Education	81	77	51	67
Health Occupations	48	58	39	47
Home Economics (Homemaking)	71	81	76	77
Home Economics (Vocational)	71	67	76	72
Trades and Industries	81	86	78	82

The nature of the study required that agriculture be a part of the vocational education curriculum in each of the schools. Business and/or Office Education and Trades and Industries were in the curricula of over four-fifths of the schools.

Some geographic area variations were noted. Business and/or Office (Vocational) and Distributive Education were in a higher percentage of the schools in the Mountains than the other two areas. The Piedmont area had more Health Occupations, Home Economics (Homemaking) and Trades and Industries programs.

Enrollments in Vocational Education Programs by Race. Principals were requested to estimate the approximate percentages of the total male students and the total female students in their schools who were enrolled in a vocational education program. Table 22 summarizes the results.

Table 22. Approximate Percentages of Total Male and Female Students Enrolled in a Vocational Education Program by Geographic Area

Sex	GEOGRAPHIC AREA			STATE AVERAGE
	Mountains	Piedmont	Coastal Plains	
Male	49.6	54.8	54.1	53.5
Female	38.2	42.3	48.7	44.4

A higher percentage of the total male student enrollment than the total female enrollment in the schools in all three geographic areas was enrolled in vocational education. The highest percentage for males was in the Piedmont and for females in the Coastal Plains. The schools in the Mountain area reported smaller percentages for both males and females than did schools in the other two areas.

The Secondary School Enrollees

Vocational Agriculture Enrollees by Race. The average number of vocational agriculture enrollees per school increased between 1971-72 and 1976-77 in each of the geographic areas. Increases by race were also reflected in each geographic area (Table 23).

Table 23. Average Number of Vocational Agriculture Enrollees Per School by Race and Geographic Area in 1971-72 and 1976-77

Geographic Area	Race								Average Number of Enrollees Statewide	
	Black		Indian		White		Other			
	1971-72	1976-77	1971-72	1976-77	1971-72	1976-77	1971-72	1976-77	1971-72	1976-77
Mountains	3.9	4.8	0.0	0.1	99.3	120.0	0.0	0.1	103.2	125.0
Piedmont	29.0	33.1	5.6	4.5	88.5	92.7	0.0	0.0	123.1	130.3
Coastal Plains	45.2	65.4	6.0	8.3	67.6	75.8	0.0	5.0	118.8	154.5
Statewide	30.6	41.9	4.6	5.3	82.3	90.4	0.0	2.0	115.7	136.6

The lowest average number of blacks enrolled per school were in Mountain schools while the Coastal Plains schools had the highest average number of black students. The Coastal Plains also had the largest average number of Indians enrolled in vocational agriculture. The average number of Indian enrollees increased slightly over the five year period in both the Mountains and Coastal Plains. A decrease in Indian enrollees was noted for the Piedmont. The highest percentage increase by race during the period was for black enrollees.

Vocational Agriculture Enrollees by Sex. There were approximately 6 male enrollees in vocational agriculture programs in 1976-77 for each female enrollee. This had changed from a ratio of 10.7 males for each female enrollee in 1971-72 (See Table 24).

Table 24. Average Number of Vocational Agriculture Enrollees in Each School by Sex and Geographic Area, 1971-72 and 1976-77

Sex of Enrollees	GEOGRAPHIC AREA							
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains		State Average	
	1971-72	1976-77	1971-72	1976-77	1971-72	1976-77	1971-72	1976-77
Female	4.7	16.2	8.6	23.4	16.0	26.5	10.6	23.4
Male	102.5	113.0	112.4	107.6	98.0	109.6	104.0	109.5
TOTALS:	107.2	129.2	121.0	131.0	114.0	136.1	114.6	132.9

The reader should note when comparing Table 24 with Table 22 that Table 22 deals with enrollees in all vocational education programs while Table 24 is concerned only with vocational agriculture enrollees. It should also be noted that the average number of vocational agriculture enrollees per school (Table 24) when comparisons are made by race (Table 23) do not correspond. The number of teachers responding to each question differed.

There was a considerable increase in the average number of female enrollees in vocational agriculture per school for each of the geographic areas. The highest percentage occurred in the Mountains. The average number of male enrollees in the program per school in the Piedmont area actually decreased for the five year period.

Teachers accounted for the increase in female enrollments by noting that more courses were being opened up to girls and that the nature of course offerings was becoming more attractive to them.

Vocational Agriculture Enrollees by Place of Residence. Just over one-half the teachers in the study provided meaningful data concerning their vocational agriculture enrollees by place of residence. Table 25 shows the average number of vocational agriculture enrollees in each school by place of residence for 1971-72 and for 1976-77.

Table 25. Average Number of Vocational Agriculture Enrollees Per School by Place of Residence, 1971-72 and 1976-77

Place of Residence	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						State Average	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	1971-72	1976-77	1971-72	1976-77	1971-72	1976-77	1971-72	1976-77
Urban	4.4	8.8	12.0	24.1	17.5	23.5	12.2	20.9
Rural	97.6	103.4	99.0	107.3	96.0	109.3	97.3	107.0
Totals:	102.0	112.2	111.0	131.4	113.5	132.8	109.5	127.9

The average number of vocational agriculture enrollees from urban areas increased by large percentages in both the Mountains and Piedmont areas from 1971-72 to 1976-77. The average number of rural enrollees per school increased statewide and for each of the geographic areas.

Most responses dealing with accounting for the change(s) over the five year period indicated such factors as school consolidation, farming becoming more profitable, larger farms and mechanization, and the general population increase.

Direction of Enrollment Changes Over Five Year Period. Over one-half the teachers in each of the three geographic areas indicated that vocational agriculture enrollments in their schools had increased between the school years 1971-72 and 1976-77 (Table 26).

Table 26. Direction of Enrollment Changes in Vocational Agriculture by Geographic Area Between 1971-72 and 1976-77

Direction of Change	GEOGRAPHIC AREA			Statewide Average
	Mountains	Piedmont	Coastal Plains	
	Percent Respondents	Percent Respondents	Percent Respondents	Percent Respondents
Increased	59	56	51	54
Remained About the Same	35	12	37	28
Decreased	6	26	9	15
Don't Know or Cannot Compare	0	6	3	3

Slightly more than one-seventh of the teachers statewide noted a decrease in enrollments during the five year period. However, over one-fourth of the Piedmont teachers reported decreases.

Increases were accounted for by programs becoming more attractive to non-rural students and girls regardless of place of residence, by more course offerings, the population increase, and larger high schools.

Declines were accounted for by the increase in non-vocational agriculture offerings, teachers diverted to non-vocational agriculture duties, and the loss of the ninth grade program.

Changes in Vocational Agriculture Student Preparation and Interest. Students completing vocational agriculture programs in 1976-77 were expected to be better prepared to enter gainful occupations in agriculture than were students completing programs in 1971-72, so reported over one-half the teachers. Students in fewer than one-tenth the schools were expected to be less well prepared. Few variations were noted by geographic area and the data are summarized below on a Statewide basis:

Less well prepared-	7.37%
Similarly prepared-	35.79%
Better prepared-	54.74%
No response-	2.11%

Respondents were also asked to compare the interest levels for gainful occupations in agriculture of their 1976-77 enrollees with the enrollees of 1971-72. The Statewide data are summarized below:

Less interest-	20.00%
Similar interest-	34.74%
More interest-	42.11%
No response-	3.16%

Both preparation levels and interest levels for gainful occupations in agriculture appeared to be going up slightly. The greatest gains in interest were manifested in the Piedmont area while the greatest loss of interest was found in the Coastal Plains.

The Program

A total program of vocational agriculture has traditionally included course offerings, laboratory experiences, and supervised occupational experience programs for both in-school youth and adults. For in-school youth, Future Farmers of America activities are included.

Course Offerings. Teachers provided information about the types and numbers of courses they taught and the numbers of male and female students in each course. A detailed listing of courses and average enrollments is in Appendix F, but the following three tables show geographic area differences on three types of course offerings, eleven course areas or courses, and the scope of male-female enrollments in these areas.

Table 27 shows the differences among the geographic areas on three major types of course or course area offerings, i.e., exploratory courses, skill development courses and non-agriculture courses taught by vocational agriculture teachers in 1977.

Courses or Course Areas by Geographic Area, 1977

Types of Offerings	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						State Average	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Exploratory Courses	42	42.0	93	38.9	88	37.1	223	38.7
Skill Development Courses	58	58.0	140	58.6	137	57.8	335	58.2
Non-Agric. Courses			6	2.5	12	5.1	18	3.1
TOTALS:	100	100.0	239	100.0	237	100.0	576	100.0

Nearly two-fifths (38.7%) of the curricula offerings were encompassed in exploratory courses, basically offered to freshman and sophomore students. The bulk of the course offerings (58.2%) was reported as skill development courses. Only a slight difference in offerings by regions appeared and that in the Coastal Plains where 5.1 percent of the courses taught by the teachers were classified as non-agriculture. The Mountain group reported no "non-agriculture" course offerings.

Table 28 shows offerings by course area.

Table 28. Composition of Vocational Agriculture Curriculum by Number and Percent of Course Areas Taught by Vocational Agriculture Teachers

Course Area or Course Offerings	GEOGRAPHIC AREA						State Average	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Introduction to Agriculture	23	23.0	61	25.5	59	24.7	143	24.8
Agri. Science & Mechanics	19	19.0	32	13.4	29	12.2	80	13.9
Agricultural Production	13	13.0	9	3.8	13	5.5	35	6.1
Agricultural Supplies			2	.8	1	.4	3	.5
Agricultural Mechanics	19	19.0	41	17.1	45	19.0	105	18.2
Ornamental Horticulture	18	18.0	54	22.6	33	13.9	105	18.2
Agricultural Resources	1	1.0	11	4.6	23	9.7	35	6.1
Forestry	6	6.0	12	5.0	11	4.6	29	5.0
Multiple Occupations			3	1.2	3	1.3	6	1.0
Other Agriculture Courses	1	1.0	8	3.3	8	3.4	17	3.0
Non-Agriculture Courses			6	2.5	12	5.1	18	3.1
TOTALS:	100	100.0	239	99.8	237	99.8	576	99.9

The first year exploratory course, Introduction to Agriculture, accounted for about one-fourth of the total course offerings statewide. Agricultural Mechanics and Ornamental Horticulture, each accounting for 18.2 percent of the state total, were tied for second place. By geographic area, Ornamental Horticulture appeared most popular in the Piedmont. Contrary to expectations, Agricultural Production (at 13.0 percent of the offerings) was more popular in the Mountains than in the Coastal Plains. At the same time, the course offerings in the areas of Agricultural Resources, Multiple Occupations and "Other Agricultural Courses" were greater in the Coastal Plains than in the Mountains.

A comparison of male and female average enrollments per class is shown in Table 29.

Table 29. Average Number of Male and Female Enrollees by Course or Course Area

Course or Course Areas	Geographic Area						State Averages	
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains			
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Introduction to Agri.	21.5		16.5	.8	15.7	2.0	17.0	1.1
Agri. Science and Mechanics	17.7	.8	17.6	.8	18.1	.8	17.8	.7
Agricultural Production	12.9	.2	16.4	2.1	17.3	2.5	16.0	1.5
Agricultural Supplies			14.5		12.0		13.7	
Agricultural Mechanics	17.2	.1	16.0	.4	15.7	1.4	16.1	.8
Ornamental Horticulture	12.7	4.5	11.2	7.7	8.4	11.2	10.6	8.3
Agricultural Resources	9.0	11.0	11.6	8.1	13.8	5.7	12.9	6.6
Forestry	10.7	1.0	17.2	1.8	16.4	3.3	15.5	2.2
Multiple Occupations			8.7	7.7	20.3	.7	14.5	4.2
Other Agriculture Courses	9.0		13.5	5.5	12.0	8.4	12.5	6.5
Non-Agriculture Courses			28.0		22.0	6.0	24.0	4.0

Most class enrollments consisted largely of male students. However, the areas of Ornamental Horticulture and Agricultural Resources indicated average enrollments, statewide, of about eight and seven girl students, respectively. In addition, the "other," unspecified agriculture courses averaged above six girls per class and the multi-occupations (co-op. programs) appeared popular for females with four or more girls per class.

Some differences by geographic area were indicated by the large average membership (11.0) reported for females in Agricultural Resources classes in the Mountains compared to 8.1 and 5.7 for the other areas. Female enrollment in Ornamental Horticulture also varied by the area with the Coastal Plains reporting more than eleven female students enrolled per class to only 4 or 5 for the Mountains. Finally, the "co-op courses" of the Piedmont had nearly equal numbers of males and females in the classes.

The total average enrollment in the non-agriculture classes were much higher than for any agriculture class except for the Mountain area, which did not report teaching any non-agriculture classes.

Instructional Emphasis. Between 1972 and 1977 considerable change occurred in the emphasis of teachers on the various instructional areas of vocational agriculture. The greatest change was the increased emphasis upon Horticulture which moved from sixth rank, statewide, to first place among the ten areas considered. See Table 30 for details.

Within the geographic areas in 1972, Horticulture was ranked from 4th to 7th place but in 1977 reached first rank with the Piedmont and Coastal Plains teachers and second place with the Mountain teachers.

In general, it appeared that the curriculum emphasis became more uniform across the state in 1977 than in 1972. Forestry (ranked 4th in the Mountains in 1977 and 7th and 9th in the other areas) was the only major exception. In the other nine instructional areas, the maximum difference in emphasis was two rankings among the three regions; but, in 1972, four instructional areas showed differences among the regions amounting to three ranks for four different instructional areas (Horticulture, Agricultural Exploration, Forestry, and Agricultural Construction).

Agricultural Mechanics, ranked first in 1972 and second in 1977, lost very little emphasis as 72 percent of the teachers (compared to 73 percent in 1972) continued to place strong emphasis upon it.

Soils instruction also received strong emphasis from 55 percent of the teachers in 1977, slightly higher than five years previously, and moved from fourth to third, statewide, in the five year period.

The areas of instruction losing emphasis were Livestock Production, Crop Production and Agricultural Construction (ranked fourth, sixth, and eighth respectively in 1977 compared to 1972 positions of second, third, and sixth).

Although Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations instruction received strong emphasis from 35 percent of the teachers, it remained in its 1972 ninth place, ahead of only Farm Management. Farm Management received strong emphasis from only 21 percent of the respondents for both the years of 1972 and 1977 and ranked last among all the instructional areas.

Table 30. Rank-Order of Teachers Emphasis Given in Ten Curriculum Areas for 1972 and 1977 by Geographic Area, N. C.

Area of Instruction	1972 Geographic Area[a] Mtn. Rank	Pdmt. Rank	CP Rank	State Percent	State Rank	1977 Geographic Area[a] Mtn. Rank	Pdmt. Rank	CP Rank	State Percent	State Rank
Horticulture	5.5	4	7	47	6	2	1	1	74	1
Agricultural Mechanics	2	1	1	73	1	1	2	2	72	2
Soils	4	5.3	6	53	4	5	3	3	55	3
Livestock Production	1	2	3	59	2	3	4	5	48	4
Agricultural Exploration	7.5	5.3	8.5	49	5	7	5	7	45	5
Crop Production	3	5.3	2	58	3	6	6	4	44	6
Forestry	5.5	8	9	31	8	4	7	9	42	7
Agricultural Construction	7.5	3	5	47	6	8	8	8	36	8
Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations	9	9	10	26	9	10	9	9	35	9
Farm Management	10	10	8.5	21	10	9	10	10	21	10

[a] Mtn. - Mountains
Pdmt. - Piedmont
CP - Coastal Plains

Courses Not Taught or Offered and Teacher Perceptions. Among the teachers who had been teaching in both 1971-72 and 1976-77, the available courses which the fewest of them had taught in the five years preceding 1976-77 included Agricultural Products and Processing II, Ornamental Horticulture I, Ornamental Horticulture II, Outdoor Recreation and Applied Ecology I, and Outdoor Recreation and Applied Ecology II. Courses which the highest percentages of the teachers had not taught but would like to offer included Agricultural Science and Mechanics, Introduction to Agriculture, Farm Production, and Farm Management.

Those courses which had been offered by the lowest percentages of schools during the five years preceding 1976-77 included Agricultural Machinery and Equipment I, Agricultural Machinery and Equipment II, Agricultural Products and Processing I, Agricultural Products and Processing II, and Outdoor Recreation and Applied Ecology I. Courses which had not been taught in their schools during that period but which the highest percentages of teachers thought should be offered included Introduction to Agriculture, Agricultural Science and Mechanics, Farm Production, and Farm Management.

Few teachers saw the need for the addition of any courses not already available. However, among those mentioned by one or two teachers were general horticulture, consumer agriculture, agricultural economics, soil science, agricultural law, fruit production, greenhouse management, dairy science, agricultural mathematics, and agricultural electricity.

The data appear to indicate a preference of teachers to return to the basic course offerings which characterized vocational agriculture programs several years ago.

Changes in Course Offering and Materials. Those respondents teaching in both 1971-72 and 1976-77 were requested to indicate how, during that five year period, course offerings and materials taught had changed in quality. Responses in percentages are shown below:

Improved in Quality -	76.04%
Remained About the Same -	20.83%
Deteriorated in Quality -	2.08%
No Response-	1.04%

The above responses on a statewide basis showed very minimal geographic area variations.

When asked to give reasons for improvement of quality, 29 teachers mentioned better provision of materials, facilities, and/or equipment; 17 teachers referred to better prepared teachers (through in-service programs); 4 teachers mentioned better planning; 4 teachers attributed the changes to better cooperation among teachers, administrators, and State officials; better course offerings were suggested by 3 teachers; and 3 references were made to heightened awareness of community needs.

One teacher indicated that the lack of another vocational agriculture teacher was cause for a deterioration in quality.

Teachers were asked to "reflect back to the beginning of your career as a Vocational Agriculture teacher" and indicate how course offerings and materials had changed. Responses (statewide) in percentages are shown below:

Improved in Quality -	83.16%
Remained About the Same -	9.47%
Deteriorated in Quality -	6.32%
No Response -	1.05%

Teachers in the Mountains area were almost unanimous in indicating an improvement in quality while slightly fewer than four-fifths of the Coastal Plains teachers thought this. Two-thirds of those indicating a deterioration in quality were Coastal Plains teachers. The factors to which they attributed these changes were similar to those given in response to the previous question.

Teacher Perceptions of Strength of Program Components. The teachers in the sample were requested to characterize the strength of the component parts of the vocational agriculture program in their schools for the 1976-77 school year. The component parts were listed and the response choices were: "Very strong," "Strong," "Average," "Weak," and "Very Weak." Their responses are shown in Table 31 with the data grouped into "Strong," "Average," or "Weak" categories and by geographic area. Note that percentages add to approximately 100 for each component by region and for the State.

Table 31. Teachers' Perceptions of the Strengths of Vocational Agriculture Components in Their Schools, 1976-77, by Geographic Area

	Geographic Area											
	Mountains			Piedmont			Coastal Plains			Statewide Average		
Component	Strong	Average	Weak	Strong	Average	Weak	Strong	Average	Weak	Strong	Average	Weak
Teachers #	18	3	0	37	9	0	46	8	1	101	20	1
%	85.7	14.3	0.0	80.4	19.6	0.0	83.6	14.5	1.8	82.8	16.4	.82
Curriculum #	16	5	0	30	15	1	41	12	2	87	32	3
%	76.2	23.8	0.0	65.2	32.6	2.2	74.5	21.9	3.6	71.3	26.2	2.5
Teaching Practices #	17	4	0	32	14	0	45	10	0	94	28	0
%	80.9	19.0	0.0	69.6	30.4	0.0	81.8	18.2	0.0	77.0	22.9	0.0
FFA #	13	5	3	24	14	8	33	12	10	70	31	21
%	61.9	23.8	14.3	52.2	30.4	17.4	60.0	21.8	18.2	57.4	25.4	17.2
Supervised Practice #	4	10	6	11	19	15	14	20	20	29	49	41
%	20.0	50.0	30.0	23.9	41.3	32.6	25.5	36.4	36.4	24.0	40.5	33.9
Adult Program #	2	4	13	9	11	21	11	15	25	22	30	59
%	10.5	21.0	68.4	19.6	23.9	45.7	20.0	27.3	45.4	18.3	25.0	49.2
Community Support #	14	7	0	31	10	5	36	14	5	81	31	10
%	66.7	33.3	0.0	67.4	21.7	10.9	65.5	25.4	9.1	66.4	25.4	8.2
Service To Community #	12	8	1	25	17	4	34	17	4	71	42	9
%	57.1	38.1	4.8	54.3	37.0	8.7	61.8	30.9	7.3	58.2	34.4	7.4

The strongest components, Statewide, were teachers, teaching practices, and curriculum. The weakest components were adult programs and supervised practice.

Teacher Perceptions of Adequacy of Facilities, Equipment and Instructional Materials.

Teachers in the sample were requested to "characterize the present status of the vocational agriculture facilities, equipment, and instructional materials in your school." They were asked to rate them as "Quite Adequate," "Generally Adequate," "Inadequate," or "Not Available." Table 32 shows the summarized data by geographic area.

Table 32. Teacher Perceptions of Adequacy of Vocational Agriculture Facilities, Equipment, and Instructional Materials, 1976-77

Facilities, Equipment or Instructional Materials		Geographic Area												Statewide Average			
		Mountains				Piedmont				Coastal Plains							
		QA	A	I	NA	QA	A	I	NA	QA	A	I	NA	QA	A	I	NA
Classroom	#	12	8	1	0	21	16	8	1	13	30	9	3	46	54	18	4
	%	57.14	38.10	4.76	0.0	45.65	34.78	17.39	2.17	23.64	54.55	16.36	5.45	37.70	44.26	14.75	3.28
Shop	#	7	9	3	2	9	20	13	4	10	28	14	3	26	57	30	9
	%	33.33	42.86	14.29	9.52	19.57	43.48	28.26	8.69	18.18	50.91	25.45	5.45	21.31	46.72	24.59	7.38
Greenhouse	#	5	8	2	6	15	21	4	6	11	15	15	14	31	44	21	26
	%	23.81	38.10	9.52	28.57	32.61	45.65	8.70	13.04	20.00	27.27	27.27	25.45	25.41	36.07	17.21	21.31
Land Laboratory	#	7	5	6	3	7	15	12	12	10	16	9	20	24	36	27	35
	%	33.33	23.81	28.57	14.29	15.22	32.61	26.09	26.09	18.18	29.09	16.36	36.36	19.67	29.51	22.13	28.69
Furniture (Classroom)	#	6	14	1	0	10	31	4	1	7	34	11	3	23	79	16	4
	%	28.57	66.67	4.76	0.0	21.74	67.39	8.70	2.17	12.73	61.82	20.00	5.45	18.65	64.75	13.11	3.28
Audio Visual	#	8	13	0	0	16	30	0	0	19	31	5	0	43	74	5	0
	%	38.10	61.90	0.0	0.0	34.78	65.22	0.0	0.0	34.55	56.36	9.09	0.0	35.25	60.66	4.10	0.0
Power Tools	#	7	11	2	1	13	26	6	1	12	33	8	2	32	70	16	4
	%	33.33	52.38	9.52	4.76	28.26	56.52	13.04	2.17	21.82	60.00	14.55	3.64	26.23	57.38	13.11	3.28
Hand Tools	#	9	11	1	0	12	26	8	0	12	37	5	1	33	74	14	1
	%	42.86	52.38	4.76	0.0	26.09	56.52	17.39	0.0	21.82	67.27	9.09	1.82	27.05	60.66	11.48	0.82
Greenhouse Equipment	#	4	7	3	7	10	25	5	6	6	27	8	14	20	59	16	27
	%	19.05	33.33	14.29	33.33	21.74	54.35	10.87	13.04	10.91	49.09	14.55	25.45	16.39	48.36	13.11	22.13
Land Laboratory Equipment	#	7	7	4	3	3	14	19	10	4	16	15	20	14	37	38	33
	%	33.33	33.33	19.05	14.28	6.52	30.43	41.30	21.74	7.27	29.09	27.27	36.36	11.48	30.33	31.15	27.05
Textbooks	#	4	11	5	0	8	25	12	1	9	27	17	2	21	63	34	3
	%	20.00	55.00	25.00	0.0	17.39	54.35	26.09	2.17	16.36	49.09	30.91	3.64	17.36	52.07	28.10	2.48
Reference Books	#	2	12	6	0	11	23	11	1	9	34	10	2	22	69	27	3
	%	10.00	60.00	30.00	0.0	23.91	50.00	23.91	2.17	16.36	61.82	18.18	3.64	18.18	57.02	22.31	2.48

Except for land laboratory equipment, three-fifths or more of the teachers indicated that all items listed under facilities, equipment or instructional materials were "quite adequate" or "adequate." The greatest inadequacies statewide were in shops, greenhouses, land laboratories, greenhouse equipment, land laboratory equipment, and textbooks.

A number of regional variations surfaced in the data. The Mountains area had the highest percentages of teachers with adequate classrooms, shops, land laboratories, classroom furniture, hand tools, land laboratory equipment, and textbooks. The Mountains area had the highest percentages of inadequacies in greenhouse equipment and in reference books. The Piedmont had the highest percentages of teachers with adequate greenhouses and greenhouse equipment and the highest percentage of inadequacies in shops and hand tools. The Coastal Plains had the highest percentages of teachers with adequate reference books and the highest percentages of inadequacies in classrooms, greenhouses, classroom furniture, audio-visuals, power tools, land laboratory equipment, and textbooks.

The Adult Education Role

Adult education has always been, at least within the ranks of agricultural education circles, a function of a total community vocational agriculture programs. Prospective teachers are prepared through course and student teaching experiences to manage an adult function in teaching vocational agriculture.

Formal Advisory Council. Central to this role is the expectation held by the State Board of Education that each vocational education program in the State have an organized advisory council. Since most advisory councils include mostly adults in its membership, one could expect that this might be considered an adult education function of the teacher. Table 33 shows the number of respondents reporting a formal advisory council.

Table 33. Number and Percent of Teachers Reporting Having an Advisory Council by Geographic Area, 1977

Geographic Area	Number	Teachers Reporting a Formal Advisory Council			
		Yes		No	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	20[a]	8	40.0	12	60.0
Piedmont	46	13	28.3	33	71.7
Coastal Plains	55	30	54.5	25	45.5
TOTALS: (State)	121a	51	42.1	70	57.8

[a] One no-response

A total of 51 teachers (42.1%) reported having a formally organized advisory council. In the sample more than half of the vocational agriculture teachers did not have such a council in operation. Teachers in the Coastal Plains were more likely to have advisory councils (54.5%), teachers in the Mountains next (40.0%), and teachers in the Piedmont last with (28.3%).

Regularly Organized Adult Education Program in Agriculture. In order to qualify as having "a regularly organized adult education program in agriculture," adult education membership and an educational program in agriculture as a part of the local vocational agriculture program was necessary. Table 34 show the reported results.

Table 34. Number and Percent of Teachers Reporting a Regularly Organized Adult Education in Agriculture by Geographic Area, 1977

Geographic Area	Had a Regular Organized Adult Program			
	Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	4	19.1	17	80.9
Piedmont (1)	16	34.8	29	63.0
Coastal Plains	22	40.0	33	60.0
Total(State)	42	34.4	79	64.7

(1) One no-response

Roughly one of every three teachers (34.4%) reported having a regularly organized adult education program in agriculture. Forty percent of the teachers in the Coastal Plains reported having adult programs. In the Piedmont, 34.8% of the teachers reported having an adult program. Teachers in the Mountain area were lowest in that only 19.1% reported having a regularly organized adult education program.

Statewide, for teachers with adult education programs, average enrollments increased from 25 in 1972 to 31 in 1977. Average attendance reported for meetings declined from 25 to 20 adults. The average number of meetings annually for adult education groups was 8.4 in 1977 and 8.7 in 1972.

Teachers who indicated that they had no regularly organized adult education program in agriculture were asked to explain why. The most frequently mentioned factor was lack of time, or decreased time, with 16 teachers referring to this. Fifteen teachers said the community colleges and technical institutes were assuming the task and 8 referred to a lack of, or decreasing interest in or need for,adult education. Less-than-12-month contracts was mentioned five times. Less frequent references were made to discouragement by the superintendent, no travel allowance, and energy conservation. Several other factors were mentioned only once.

Table 35 deals with resporses to a question dealing with how emphasis given to adult education by the respondent teachers changed between 1972 and 1977.

Table 35. Number and Percent of Teachers by Emphasis Given to Adult Education in 1977 Compared to Five Years Ago (1972) and by Geographic Area, North Carolina, 1977

Geographic Area	Emphasis Given to Adult Education					
	More		Same		Less	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	1	5.6	9	50.0	8	44.4
Piedmont	2	5.7	18	51.4	15	42.9
Coastal Plains	5	11.9	16	38.1	20	47.6
Total (State)	8	8.4	43	45.3	43	45.3

Few teachers in the state (8.4%) reported giving more emphasis to adult education in 1977 than in 1972. An equal percentage of teachers (45.3%) reported giving either the "same" or "less" emphasis to adult education for the five year period. In the Coastal Plains a higher percentage of teachers reported giving both more (11.9%) and less (47.6%) emphasis to adult education than did teachers in the other geographic areas. Fewer teachers in the Coastal Plains (38.1%) gave the same emphasis to adult education in 1977 as they did in 1972.

Teachers were asked to account for changes in the emphasis given to adult education over the period. All except six of the teachers who responded to this question had reported decreasing emphasis. By far the most frequent reason given was "less time" now for adult education. Fifteen teachers gave this reason. Eight teachers said community colleges caused the change and three said technical institutes and extension service made a difference. A variety of other factors were mentioned once.

Teachers were asked, "Would you prefer to give more emphasis to adult education?" Their responses are summarized in Table 36.

Table 36. Number and Percent of Teachers in Terms of Preference to Giving More Attention to Adult Education, by Geographic Area, North Carolina, 1977

Geographic Area	Preference For More Emphasis to Adult Education			
	Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	16	76.2	5	23.8
Piedmont	32	69.6	14	30.4
Coastal Plains	40	72.7	15	27.3
Totals (State)	88	72.1	34	27.9

Almost three of four teachers across the state (72.1%) indicated they would prefer to give more emphasis to adult education in agriculture.

Teachers who reported a preference for giving more emphasis to adult education were asked to list barriers preventing this increased emphasis. Table 36 shows that more than half of those responding (39 of 75) said "lack of time" was a barrier. Eight teachers thought there was a lack of interest on the part of the adults, often characterized by poor attendance or participation. Four teachers said county officials had advised them to let the community colleges assume the responsibility for adult education. Four teachers believed the technical institutes could offer more valuable degrees, and four others pointed to a lack of adequate travel funds. Three teachers said they did not have adequate facilities for handling adult education.

Table 37. Voluntary Expressions of Vocational Agriculture Teachers on Local Barriers to More Emphasis on Adult Education, N. C., 1977

Barriers	Number of Times Mentioned
Lack of Time	39
Lack of Interest, Poor Attendance	8
County Office Says Let Community Colleges Do It	4
Technical Institutes Can Offer More Valuable Degrees	4
No Travel Funds	4
Lack of Facilities	3
County Says Not a Part of Vo. Ag. Job	2
No Support	2
Lack of Funds	2
Short Employment	2
Lack Permission to Use Building at Night	1
Need a Survey of Local Interest	1
Fuel Crisis	1
Both Parents Working	1
Veteran's Program	1
TOTAL RESPONSES:	75

Teachers were asked, "Should more emphasis be given to adult education by vocational agriculture teachers?" The responses are noted in Table 38.

Table 38. Number and Percent of Teachers Indicating Whether More Emphasis Should be Given Adult Education, by Geographic Area, North Carolina, 1977

Geographic Area	Should More Emphasis Be Given to Adult Education?			
	Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	17	80.9	4	19.1
Piedmont	40	87.0	5	10.9
Coastal Plains	40	72.7	15	27.3
Total (State)	97	79.5	24	19.7

Over three-fourths of the teachers in the sample (79.5%) indicated that more emphasis should be given to adult education in agriculture by teachers of agriculture. The "should" exceeds teacher preference in both the Mountains and Piedmont areas, but not in the Coastal Plains (See Table 36).

Table 39 summarizes responses to barriers to increased emphasis on adult education. Of those teachers who thought adult education should receive more emphasis by vocational agriculture teachers, 34, or 35.0 percent, referred to a lack of time as a barrier to giving increased emphasis. Eleven, or 11.3percent were discouraged by county and local administration. Seven, or 7.2 percent, cited a lack of adequate funding, and six, or 6.2 percent, mentioned too few months employed. Five, or 5.1 percent, believed the community colleges were instrumental in meeting much of the need for adult education and four teachers, or 4.1 percent, referred to a lack of interest by farmers. Lack of time seemed by far to be the greatest perceived barrier to more emphasis on adult education by over one in four vocational agriculture teachers in the state.

Table 39. Voluntary Viewpoints of Vocational Agriculture Teachers on General Barriers to More Adult Education, N.C., 1977

Barriers	Times Reported (N)	Percent of Teachers Favoring More Emphasis (N=97)	Percent of All Teachers in Sample (N=121)
Lack of Time	34	35.05	28.10
Discouraged by County and Local Administrators	11	11.34	9.09
Lack of Funds	7	7.22	5.78
Too Few Months Employed	6	6.18	4.96
Community Colleges Filling Some of the Need	5	5.15	3.30
Lack of Interest by Farmers	4	4.12	1.65
Lack of Teacher Motivation	2	2.06	.008
Less Emphasis by State Supervising Staff	1	1.03	.008
Teachers Have Too Many Outside Interests	1	1.03	.008
Lack of Resources	1	1.03	.008
Non-Agriculture Duties	1	1.03	.008
Other Programs of Similar Nature	1	1.03	.008
Adults Don't Need Scheduled Meetings: Need Specific Information	1	1.03	.008

Role of Technical Institutes in Adult Education in Agriculture. The introduction of the technical institute in the State gave rise to additional opportunities for adults. This study looked at the extent to which vocational agriculture teachers perceived these institutions had assumed the major responsibility for adult education in agriculture. Responses to this inquiry are shown in Table 40.

Table 40. Number and Percent of Teachers Who Think Technical Institutes Have Assumed the Major Responsibilities for Adult Education in Agriculture, by Geographic Area, North Carolina, 1977

Geographic Area	Has the Technical Institute in Your Area Assumed the Major Responsibilities for Adult Education in Agriculture?			
	Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	12	57.1	9	42.9
Piedmont	25	55.6	20	44.4
Coastal Plains	30	54.5	25	45.4
Totals	67	55.4	54	44.6

A majority of the teachers in the state (55.4%) indicated that the technical institute in their area had assumed the major responsibilities for adult education in agriculture. This belief appeared uniform throughout the state. Over one-third of the teachers in the state (37%) indicated they had taught an adult education course in a technical institute within the past five years. When asked if they had taught a short course in the community in the past year (example: garden clubs, etc.), 27 percent indicated that they had.

Place of Adult Education in Public High Schools. Teachers reported a number of reasons why they believed adult education has a place in public high schools. Practically all who responded felt that adult education did belong in the high schools. When asked why, the most frequent answers had to do with the belief that the program helps adults to stay abreast of new advances in knowledge and technology. Many felt that the high schools owe such help to community members, and that the high school is the most accessible facility to residents.

The few teachers who responded in opposition to adult education in public high schools most often cited a lack of time to handle adult education, or a belief that community colleges and technical institutes should assume the responsibility.

Supervised Occupational Experience and Home Visits

Supervised occupational experience programs and home visits made as a part of that supervision have characterized vocational agriculture programs since 1917. However, since the Vocational Education Act of 1963, less emphasis has been given to this component of the program.

This study looked at current practices and changes over the past five year period.

Home Visitation

There appeared to be little difference among the geographic areas in the practice of visiting the homes of Vocational Agriculture students. This is shown in Table 41. Statewide and in each of the areas, more than half the teachers reported visiting students on a regular basis. Approximately one-third of the teacher respondents (ranging from 28 percent to 34 percent) said that the 1977 emphasis on visits was less than for 1972.

The Piedmont group, with the lowest percentage reporting a regular visitation program (54.4%), had the highest percentage of teachers (14.3%) providing more emphasis on visitation in 1977 than in 1972. The table also indicates that it was the general practice of most of the teachers (82%) to involve the student's family on the home visit. Variations in family involvement on visits by geographic areas ranged from 90.4 percent for the Mountains, and 84 percent for the Piedmont to 78 percent for the Coastal Plains.

Table 41. Teacher Visits to Vocational Agriculture Students' Homes, N.C., 1977

Geographic Area	Visits on a (1) Regular Basis				Comparison of Visit(2) Emphasis, '77 over '72						Teacher Tries to Involve Student Family on Visits (3)									
	Yes		No		More		Same		Less		Always		Usually		Sometimes		Seldom		None	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Mountains	12	60.0	8	40.0	0	0	13	72.2	5	27.8	7	33.3	12	57.1	2	9.5	0	0	0	0
Piedmont	25	54.4	21	45.7	5	14.3	18	51.4	12	34.3	18	40.9	19	43.2	3	6.8	1	2.3	1	2.3
Coastal Plains	32	60.4	21	39.6	2	4.9	26	63.4	13	31.7	21	38.9	21	38.9	7	13.0	1	1.9	0	0
State	69	58.0	50	42.0	7	7.5	57	60.6	30	31.9	46	38.7	52	43.7	12	10.1	2	1.7	1	1.8

(1) 111 responses
(2) 94 responses
(3) 6 invalid data - 5.0% of 119 total responses

Table 42 shows the percentage of students by number of visits received each year. The largest percentage of students (35.4%) received only one visit from their teachers. On the other hand, 22.3 percent of the students received three or more visits. There appeared to be considerable difference among the geographic areas as teachers in the Piedmont failed to visit 20.5 percent of their students even once, compared to 17.8 percent for Mountains and 12.2 percent for the Coastal Plains.

Table 42. Percentage of Students Receiving Home Visits by Vocational Agriculture Teachers, North Carolina, 1977

Geographic Area	Number of Visits Each Year				
	None	One	Two	Three	Four or More
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Mountains	17.8	37.4	18.4	12.0	15.1
Piedmont	20.5	35.8	21.2	16.2	7.8
Coastal Plains	12.2	34.3	35.3	12.3	7.0
Statewide	16.0	35.4	27.5	13.7	8.6

About 13 percent of the teachers in the study were provided reimbursement for mileage for all needed visits to Vo. Ag. students but 10 teachers (8.3 percent of the respondents) reported receiving no mileage allowance. These data are shown in Table 43. Over 45 percent of the teachers reported an allowance which covered most students visited. By geographic area, the teachers in the Piedmont fared the best with only two teachers failing to get some mileage and 53 percent getting reimbursement for most of their visits.

Table 43. Number and Percentage of Teachers Reporting Mileage Allowance as Adequate for Needed Home Visitations, N. C., 1977

Geographic Area	Teachers Reporting Mileage Adequate for:							
	All Visits		Most Visits		Some Visits		No Visits	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	2	10.0	5	25.0	12	60.0	1	5.0
Piedmont	8	17.9	16	35.6	16	35.6	2	4.4
Coastal Plains	5	9.1	19	34.6	23	41.8	7	12.7
State(1)	15	12.5	40	33.3	51	42.5	10	8.3

(1) 4 invalid responses of 120 returns

Most teachers reported encouragement by their principals to make home visits. See Table 44 for details. Only four teachers reported that their principals actually discouraged them, but a rather large percentage (32.2 percent) indicated that principals were indifferent in their attitudes toward home visits. Nearly 48 percent of the teachers in the Mountain area reported that visits made no difference to their principals. Administrators from the Piedmont appeared more encouraging to their teachers as two-thirds were rated this way.

Table 44. Teachers' Viewpoints of Principals' Attitudes Toward Home Visits, N.C., 1977

Geographic Area	Attitude of Principal					
	Encourages		Discourages		Makes No Difference	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	10	47.6	1	4.8	10	47.6
Piedmont	30	66.7	2	4.4	12	26.7
Coastal Plains	34	61.8	1	1.8	17	30.9
Statewide (1)	74	61.2	4	3.3	39	32.2

(1) Invalid data of 4 responses (3.3%) of a total of 121

Supervised Occupational Experience (S.O.E.) Programs

Teachers were requested to indicate the percentage of their students who were expected or required to develop supervised occupational experience programs. The teachers from the Mountains and Coastal Plains areas said that two-thirds of their students were expected to have S.O.E. programs but the Piedmont teachers indicated this goal for only 45 percent of their students.

Nearly all teachers reported (Table 45) class time used for studying S.O.E. problems. Compared to 1972, teacher use of class time for S.O.E. in 1977 was reported as "greater" by 16 percent of the respondents, "the same" by 56 percent and "less" by nearly 28 percent. The greatest decrease in emphasis was given by the Mountains teachers followed by those from the Coastal Plains.

Table 45. Teacher Emphasis on Supervised Occupational Experience Program (S.O.E.), N.C., 1977

Geographic Area	Respondents		Teachers Providing Class Time for S.O.E. Study(1)				Teacher Emphasis on Class Time for S.O.E. in 1977 Over 1972					
	Teachers Responding	Percentage of Students	Yes		No		More		Same		Less	
			No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Mountains	18	67.5	19	95.0	1	5.0	1	5.6	10	55.6	7	38.9
Piedmont	44	44.8	38	84.4	7	15.6	8	22.9	19	54.3	8	22.9
Coastal Plains	55	66.4	52	94.6	3	5.5	6	14.6	24	58.5	11	26.8
Statewide	117	58.4	109	90.8	11	9.2	15	16.0	53	56.4	26	27.7

(1) 120 responses

(2) 94 responses

The data in Table 46 support that in Table 45 regarding teacher emphasis on S.O.E. programs for students. Statewide, some 54 percent of the students were reported as having developed S.O.E. programs, and it was previously recorded that teachers "expected" 58 percent of their students to develop them. The percentages of students by grade level having supervised occupational experience programs appear uniform with the possible exception of freshmen students in the Mountains who showed up much higher than those in other grade levels. The Piedmont had a lower percentage of students reported with S.O.E. programs (45.5 percent) than the other regions.

Table 46. Number and Percentage of Students Having Supervised Occupational Experience Program by Grade Level, N. C., 1977

Geographic Area	Enrollment by Grade Level		Students With S.O.E. Programs	
	Grade Level	Number	Number	Percentage
Mountains	9	298	198	66.4
	10	478	225	47.0
	11	473	248	52.4
	12	395	182	46.0
Total:		1664	853	51.9
Piedmont	9	911	377	41.3
	10	902	396	43.9
	11	927	457	49.3
	12	912	430	47.1
Total:		3652	1660	45.5
Coastal Plains	9	855	507	59.3
	10	627	411	65.5
	11	1015	648	63.8
	12	872	600	68.8
Total:		3369	2166	64.3
Statewide	9	2064	1082	52.4
	10	2007	1032	51.4
	11	2415	1353	56.0
	12	2179	1212	55.6
Total:		8665	4679	54.0

Student opportunities for supervised occupational experience programs (as two-thirds of the teachers reported) were equal or better in 1977 than in 1972, according to data in Table 47. Opportunities in the Piedmont area were more improved in 1977 over 1972 than in the other geographic areas. Nearly 29 percent of Piedmont teachers reported better opportunities in 1977 compared to 16.7 percent and 14.6 percent for the other areas.

Table 47. Teachers Report of Student Opportunities for S.O.E. in 1977 Compared to 1972

Geographic Area	Opportunities in 1977 Compared to 1972					
	Better		Same		Fewer	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	3	16.7	9	50.0	6	33.3
Piedmont	10	28.6	13	37.1	12	34.3
Coastal Plains	6	14.6	20	48.8	15	36.3
Statewide	19	20.2	42	46.7	33	35.1

Table 48 shows future emphasis to be given to S.O.E. programs by teachers in the study. In the future one-half of the teachers will increase the emphasis to S.O.E. Another 48.4 percent will be giving the same emphasis as was being given in 1977. Only one teacher envisioned less emphasis upon S.O.E. programs in the future.

Table 48. Plans of Vocational Agriculture Teachers for Future Emphasis to S.O.E. Programs, N. C., 1977

Geographic Area	Emphasis to Programs in Future					
	More		Same		Less	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	9	42.9	12	57.1	0	0
Piedmont	21	45.7	24	52.2	1	2.2
Coastal Plains	32	58.2	23	41.8	0	0
Statewide	62	50.8	59	48.4	1	.8

Table 49 reports the findings when teachers were asked to judge the strength of the S.O.E. component of their vocational agriculture programs. About one-fourth reported the programs as "Strong" or "Very Strong." However, thirty-four percent said their S.O.E. programs were "Weak" or "Very Weak." By geographic area, the judgments were uniform for percentages reporting weak programs but the teachers from the Coastal Plains tended to rate their programs slightly higher overall.

Table 49. Teacher Viewpoints of the Strengths of the Supervised Occupational Experience Programs in Their Schools, N.C., 1977

Geographic Area	Very Strong		Strong		Average		Weak		Very Weak	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	0	0	4	20.0	10	50.0	5	25.0	1	5.0
Piedmont	0	0	11	23.9	19	41.3	11	23.9	4	8.7
Coastal Plains	2	3.6	12	21.8	20	36.4	14	25.5	7	10.9
Statewide	2	1.7	27	22.3	49	40.5	30	24.8	11	9.1

121 responses but 2 invalid answers

The Future Farmers of America organization is officially an integral part of the program of vocational agriculture. The following tables document the status of the F.F.A. in North Carolina in 1972 and 1977 and the role of the teachers in this aspect of the program.

Status and Membership

Table 50 shows that nearly all (118 of 121) of the teacher respondents in the study reported an F.F.A. Chapter in their schools. However, in 1977 only 64 percent of the vocational agriculture students in these schools were members of a chapter. Within the state, the Coastal Plains area reported the highest percentage of vocational agriculture enrollees with F.F.A. membership (67 percent). F.F.A. membership declined in all three geographic areas between 1972 and 1977. The overall decline of 7 percent (71.0 percent to 64.0 percent) ranged from a 3 percent loss in the Coastal Plains to the 9.6 percent and 11.3 percent declines in the Piedmont and Mountains areas, respectively.

The average membership per Chapter showed a slight increase from 1972 to 1977. However, there was a substantial decline in the percentage of vocational agriculture students who became members of the F.F.A.

Table 50. Status of F.F.A. Chapters, 1977, and Number and Percentage of Vocational Agriculture Enrollees in Membership, 1972 and 1977

Geographic Area	Teachers Reporting F.F.A. Chapters		F.F.A. Membership			
			1972		1977	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent of Enrollees	Number	Percent of Enrollees
Mountains	20	95.2	96.8	76.2	104.0	64.9
Piedmont	44	95.7	86.7	69.2	94.1	59.6
Coastal Plains	54	100.0	102.1	70.2	103.3	67.3
Statewide	118	97.5	95.2	71.0	100.0	64.0

Table 51 contains three separate groups of data on teacher viewpoints toward the F.F.A. program. One measure of an attitude about an area is the amount of time devoted to it. One-third of the teachers reported more time spent on F.F.A. in 1977 than in 1972. The Piedmont teachers had nearly 43 percent of the respondents showing more time in 1977 while teachers from the Mountains reported 16.7 percent in this category. At the other extreme, 1/4 (22 percent) of all the teachers said they spent less time in 1977 than in 1972 with F.F.A.

Over 80 percent of the teachers indicated they did not see F.F.A. as extracurricular. Moreover, 60 percent said their principals also did not see F.F.A. as extracurricular. The data indicate that the Mountain principals and teachers were more in accord concerning the integral nature of F.F.A. and vocational agriculture than were the groups from the other two geographic areas.

Table 51. Viewpoints of Teachers Toward F.F.A. Program

Geographic Area	Time Expended '77 vs '72(1)						Sees F.F.A. As Extracurricular(2)				Feels Principal Sees F.F.A. as Extracurricular(3)			
	More		Same		Less		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Mountains	3	16.7	11	61.1	4	22.2	5	23.8	16	76.2	5	25.0	15	75.0
Piedmont	15	42.9	16	45.7	4	11.4	10	21.7	36	78.3	17	37.0	27	58.7
Coastal Plains	13	31.7	15	36.3	13	31.7	7	12.7	48	87.3	22	40.0	33	60.0
State	31	33.0	42	44.7	21	22.3	22	18.0	100	82.0	44	36.4	75	62.0

(1) 94 responses
(2) 122 responses
(3) invalid data for 2 of the 121 responses

Table 52 shows responses concerning the strength of the F.F.A. program. Over one-half (57 percent) of the teacher respondents rated their F.F.A. programs as "strong" or "very strong" whereas 17 percent classified the programs as "weak" or "very weak." Teachers from the Mountains area tended to rate their programs higher than the State average while teachers from the Coastal Plains area showed weaker ratings for their programs.

Teachers believed the F.F.A. program was stronger in 1977 than in 1972. Teachers in the Piedmont were particularly positive, with 55.9 percent listing it as stronger in 1977. Over the state, fewer than one-fifth of the teachers marked the F.F.A. program as weaker in 1977 than in 1972.

Table 52. Teacher Viewpoints of the Strength of F.F.A. Programs, N.C.

Geographic Area	Program Strength 1977 vs 1972						Level of F.F.A. Strength in 1977									
	Stronger		Same		Weaker		Very Strong		Strong		Average		Weak		Very Weak	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Mountains	7	41.2	6	35.3	4	23.5	4	19.1	9	42.9	5	23.8	2	9.5	1	4.8
Piedmont	19	55.9	9	26.5	5	14.7	8	17.4	16	34.8	14	30.4	4	8.7	4	8.7
Coastal Plains	19	46.3	12	29.3	9	22.0	17	30.9	16	29.1	12	21.2	10	18.2	0	0
State	45	48.9	27	29.4	18	19.6	29	23.8	41	33.6	31	25.4	16	13.1	5	4.1

In summary, teachers were strongly supportive of the F.F.A. and felt their principals were also. Nevertheless, a considerable proportion of the teachers (42 percent) rated the strength of their F.F.A. programs in 1977 as average or below.

F.F.A. Chapter Meeting Times

The vast majority (85 percent for the State as a whole) of F.F.A. Chapters held some meetings during school hours. This is reflected in data in Table 53. However, about half of the chapters (49.2 percent) held some night meetings. More of the Mountains teachers (62 percent) reported holding night meetings than respondents from the other geographic areas.

Table 53. Meeting Times for F.F.A. Chapters, N.C. 1977

Geographic Area	Meeting Times											
	During School Hours				After School				At Night			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Mountains	17	81.0	4	19.1	6	30.0	12	60.0	13	62.0	6	28.6
Piedmont	36	78.3	10	21.7	14	30.4	27	58.8	21	45.7	19	41.3
Coastal Plains	51	92.7	3	5.5	19	35.9	23	43.4	25	47.2	18	34.0
Statewide	104	85.2	17	13.9	39	32.8	62	52.1	59	49.2	43	35.8

Future Emphasis on F.F.A.

The future will bring more emphasis upon the F.F.A. program, said 58.2 percent of the teachers. All the others, except one, indicated they would maintain the present emphasis (Table 54). Among the geographic areas, 62 percent of the Coastal Plains teacher respondents were aiming for more F.F.A. program emphasis in the future.

Table 54. Future Emphasis Upon F.F.A. Program, N.C., 1977

Geographic Area	Future Emphasis					
	More		About the Same		Less	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	10	47.6	11	52.4	0	0
Piedmont	27	58.7	19	41.3	0	0
Coastal Plains	34	61.8	20	36.4	1	1.8
Statewide	71	58.2	50	41.0	1	.8

State Convention and Camping Program

Chapter participation at the State level during the 1975-76 period was extensive, with over 80 percent of the F.F.A. chapters represented by respondents in the study attending the State F.F.A. Convention and 52.5 percent participating in the regular F.F.A. camping program. Table 54 shows little difference by regions for attendance at the State Convention but Mountains chapters were 10 percent below the State average for participation in the camping program.

Table 55. F.F.A. Chapter Participation in State Level Activities During 1975-76 School Year

Geographic Area	Represented at State Convention				Participation in a Regular Camping Week			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	17	81.0	4	19.1	10	42.6	11	52.4
Piedmont	37	80.4	9	19.6	24	52.2	21	45.7
Coastal Plains	47	85.5	8	14.6	30	54.6	25	45.5
Statewide	101	82.8	21	17.2	64	52.5	57	46.7

Proficiency Awards and Written Programs of Activities

Table 56 is a summary of chapter participation in the Proficiency Awards Program and the extent to which chapters had a written program of activities. Slightly over half (53.3 percent) of the chapters reported having at least three proficiency award entries for 1977, with the Mountains area showing approximately 62 percent of the chapters active in this part of the program. Greater success was shown in the development of written chapter programs of activities as 93 teacher respondents (76 percent) reported their chapters had developed one. The Coastal Plains respondents headed the list with over 83 percent participation.

Table 56. F.F.A. Chapter Participation in Proficiency Awards and in Written Programs of Activities, N.C., 1977

Geographic Area	Had Three Entries in Proficiency Award Contest				Developed a Written Chapter Program of Activities			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	13	61.9	8	38.1	15	71.4	6	28.6
Piedmont	22	47.8	24	52.2	32	69.6	14	30.4
Coastal Plains	30	54.6	25	45.5	46	83.6	9	16.4
Statewide	65	53.3	57	46.7	93	76.2	29	23.8

Alumni Chapters

A state-wide system of alumni chapters appeared to be only in the very early stages of development in 1976-77 (Table 57) as only 22 respondents (18 percent) reported an affiliate in their schools. Twenty-five percent of the teachers classified alumni chapters as "very important." Another 58 percent thought them "important." Only 14 percent of the respondents reported chapters not to be important.

Table 57. Viewpoints of Teachers Toward F.F.A. Alumni Chapters, 1976-77

Geographic Area	Has An F.F.A. Alumni Chapter				Degree of Importance Attached to Maintaining an F.F.A. Alumni Chapter(a)							
	Yes		No		Very Important		Important		Little Important		Eliminate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	4	19.1	17	81.0	4	19.1	14	66.7	3	14.3	0	0
Piedmont	5	10.9	41	89.1	5	10.9	32	69.6	3	15.2	1	2.2
Coastal Plains	13	23.7	42	76.4	22	40.0	25	45.5	6	10.9	0	0
State	22	18.0	100	82.0	31	25.4	71	58.2	16	13.1	1	.8

(a) 3 missing data for 2.5 percent on 122 total

Geographic area differences surfaced in these data. Forty percent of the Coastal Plains teacher respondents rated alumni chapters as "very important," while only 11 percent of the Piedmont teacher respondents so rated them. It should be noted that only 11 percent of the Piedmont teachers had developed alumni chapters at the time of this study.

Community Activities and Change

Traditionally, teachers of vocational agriculture have been active in many roles in their local school communities. These roles have ranged from average citizen to community or organization leader to interpreter of change.

Prestige of the position of teacher of vocational agriculture and teacher morale appear to be influenced by these roles. Time for playing these roles and attitudes toward them are related to the in-school, non-vocational agriculture related responsibilities of the teacher. In this section of the report, an analysis is made of the following:

.changes in prestige of vocational agriculture teacher position

.teacher morale

.in-school, non-vocational agriculture responsibilities in teaching

.requests to explain program to groups in community

.requests for program on changes in agriculture for community groups

.would recommend occupation to high school youth.

Prestige of the Position of Vocational Agriculture Teacher

An attempt was made to determine if teachers perceived a change in the prestige of the vocational agriculture teacher position over the five-year period between 1972 and 1977. These results are summarized in Table 58.

Table 58. Teacher Perception of the Change in Prestige of the Position of Teacher of Vocational Agriculture Between 1972 and 1977

Geographic Area	Change in Prestige of "Vo Ag" Teacher					
	Increased		Remained Same		Decreased	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	2	11.1	15	83.3	1	5.5
Piedmont	7	38.7	25	71.4	3	8.6
Coastal Plains	9	5.6	27	65.8	5	12.2
Statewide	18	19.1	68	71.3	9	9.6

Almost three of every four teachers in the state (71.3 percent) felt that the prestige of the vocational agriculture teacher position had not changed over the five year period. Roughly one in five teachers (19.1 percent) indicated that the prestige of the position was higher while one in ten teachers (9.6 percent) indicated a decline in the prestige of the position.

Morale of Teachers

The morale of teachers is always a concern among teachers and others who work with teachers. Results on the changes in morale of teachers is summarized in Table 59.

Table 59. Teacher Perception of Changes in Morale Between 1972 and 1977

Geographic Area	Changes in Teacher Morale					
	Increased		Remained Same		Decreased	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	1	5.6	7	38.9	10	55.6
Piedmont	5	14.3	7	20.0	23	65.7
Coastal Plains	3	7.3	12	29.3	26	63.4
Statewide	9	9.6	26	27.7	59	62.8

Teacher morale was perceived by 62.8 percent of the teachers in the state to be lower in 1977 than in 1972. Less than one-tenth of the teachers thought morale had increased.

In-School Responsibilities of Non-Vocational Agriculture Nature

Teachers of agriculture have always considered themselves as members of a local school faculty. Yet, the expectation to deliver a complete local program in vocational agriculture demands much away from school involvement. In-school responsibilities of a non-vocational agriculture nature affect the time available for such involvement. In Table 60 a summary is given of how teachers in the state perceived in-school expectations of a non-vocational agriculture nature to have changed over a five-year period.

Table 60. Changes in In-School Responsibilities of a Non-Vocational Agriculture Nature Between 1972 and 1977

Geographic Area	Changes in Non-Vocational Agriculture Responsibilities					
	Increased		Remained Same		Decreased	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	1	5.6	14	77.8	3	16.7
Piedmont	6	17.1	25	71.4	4	11.4
Coastal Plains	12	29.3	27	65.8	2	4.9
Statewide	19	20.2	66	70.2	9	9.6

One in five teachers in the state (20.2 percent) indicated an increase in in-school non-vocational agriculture responsibilities over the five-year period. A majority of the teachers (70.2 percent) reported no change, while 9.6 percent of the teachers reported that such responsibilities had decreased over the period.

Requests for Program Interpretation

Teachers were asked how many times during the past twelve months they had been requested to interpret their vocational agriculture programs to organized groups in the community. Statewide, the mean for such activity was 1.4 times with little variation by geographic areas of the State. Roughly two of three teachers indicated that the number of requests were about the same as five years ago. Five teachers in the Coastal Plains reported an increase in requests to appear before groups to explain local vocational agriculture programs. One-fifth of the teachers in the State indicated the numbers of requests had declined in their situations.

A mean of .76 was found for the number of times teachers across the state were requested "during the past twelve months" to present a program on changes in agriculture to organized groups in the community.

Leadership Positions Held

Two of three teachers of agriculture held positions of leadership in organized groups in the community in 1977, excluding church or political groups.

Recommendation of Occupation to Others

An important consideration in studying any occupation is the extent to which incumbents of the position would recommend the occupation to others. In the case of vocational agriculture teachers, the question raised was, "Would you recommend teaching vocational agriculture to one or more students in your school?" The results are reported in Table 61.

Table 61. Number and Percent of Teachers Who Would Recommend Teaching Vocational Agriculture to One or More Students

Geographic Area	Recommendation for Teaching			
	Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mountains	20	95.2	1	4.7
Piedmont	41	89.1	4	8.7
Coastal Plains	50	90.9	5	9.1
Statewide	111	90.9	10	8.2

Nine of ten teachers indicated that they would recommend teaching vocational agriculture for consideration as a possible occupation to one or more students in their school.

Types of Occupations Entered by Program Graduates

One objective of the study dealt with types of occupations program graduates enter and leadership roles played by graduates. The intent was to illustrate these with examples of the variety of occupations entered and leadership roles played rather than a statistical analysis of a major follow-up study.

One hundred ninety-five vocational agriculture teachers provided information for this part of the study while attending the annual Vocational Agriculture Teachers Conference in Greensboro, North Carolina in August 1977.

Occupations Entered. A very high percentage of the occupations listed for former enrollees of vocational agriculture programs dealt with agriculture - either farming, sales and services to or for farmers, or other agriculture related roles. These included:

Farming
Dairying
Livestock Production
Poultry
Horticulture
Forester
DHIA Tester
Gardener
Poultry Fieldman
Landscape Designer
Food Processor
Forest Fire Warden
Laboratory Technician
Farm Supply Clerk
Farm Manager
Greenskeeper
Meat Packer
Agricultural Equipment
Nurseryman
Farm Implement Dealer
Agricultural Chemical Salesman
Farrier
Tobacco Marketing
Grain Processing
Veterinarians Assistant
Hog Buyer
Pulpwood Production
Garden Center Operator
Meat Cutter
Florist
Livestock Marketing
Feed Mill Operator
Hatcheryman

A wide variety of occupations were listed which made use of skills learned in vocational agriculture programs. Some of these were:

Carpenter
Mason
Mechanic
Grocery Store Manager
Farm Fuel Oil Supplier
Restaurant Operator
Livestock Trader
Roofing Business Owner
Surveyor
Abbatoir Manager
Commercial Fisherman
Welder
Electrician
Contractor
Federal Inspector
Artificial Breeding Technician
Tobacco Warehouse Manager
Tree Pruning Service
Tree Surgeon
Dry Wall Installer
Pipe Fitter
Plumber
Heavy Equipment Operator
Concrete Mix Operator
Maintenance
Cabinet Maker
Horse Trainer

Still other occupations appeared non-related or only slightly related to vocational agriculture:

Military Service
Highway Patrol
Auctioneer
Tire Company
Furniture Manufacturing
Emergency Medical Service Technician
Telephone Service
Fast Food Manager
Insurance Representative
Motorcycle Sales Dealer
Mortician
Automobile Dealer
Truck Driver
Textile Worker
Computer Programmer
Tax Collector

Leadership Roles. Many of these related directly to agriculture through education, service, etc. They included:

Vocational Agriculture Teacher
College Professor
Veterinarian
Entomologist
Soil Conservationist
ASCS Office Manager
Wildlife Conservationist
Production Credit Association Office Manager
Agricultural Extension Agent
Farmers Home Administration Office Manager
Agricultural Engineer

Other leadership roles listed were less directly related to vocational agriculture:

Banker
School Superintendent
Lawyer
Town Manager
Science Teacher
Doctor
Minister
School Principal
Judge
Legislator
Dentist

PROBLEM AREAS, PROBLEM SOLUTIONS, AND PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

Problem Areas and Problem Solutions

Both vocational agriculture teachers and principals were asked to examine some problems (or problem areas) which had been identified in one or more school systems in North Carolina. For each problem (or problem area) they were asked to "indicate (1) whether you believe it to be a moderate to serious problem to a good vocational agriculture program in this school community, and (2) whether you believe it to be a moderate to serious problem statewide." For the top problems identified they were requested to suggest solutions.

Teachers' Views of Problem Areas

Table 62 summarizes the responses of the teachers in rank order by geographic area.

The three top problems as perceived by the teachers on a Statewide basis were: (1) lack of time for supervising occupational experience programs; (2) vocational agriculture being deemphasized; and (3) enrollees not good vocational agriculture prospects. On a local school community basis the top three problems were: (1) lack of time for supervising occupational experience programs; (2) enrollees not good vocational agriculture prospects; and (3) too many enrollees per teacher.

There was a high level of agreement across the geographic areas regarding the number one problem Statewide and the top three problems locally. However, perceptions of the second most serious problem on a Statewide basis did not hold in either area as a very serious problem locally. The "length of contract too short" (fifth most serious problem Statewide) also did not seem to be too serious when perceived locally. Similarly, "lack of school administrator support" was viewed as a more serious problem Statewide than it was locally.

It appeared that "too many reports," "lack of State supervisory assistance," and "little student interest in program" were greater problems locally than Statewide. "Lack of school administrator support," "too many non-agriculture related duties," "length of annual contract," and "vocational agriculture being deemphasized" were much greater problems Statewide than they were locally.

"Lack of adequate equipment" and "lack of adequate curricular and/or teaching materials" did not appear to be serious problems either locally or Statewide.

Table 62 Teachers' Rank Order of Moderate-to-Serious Problem Areas in Vocational Agriculture, Local and Statewide, by Geographic Area, 1977

Problem Areas (a)	Rank-Order of Local Problems				Rank-Order of Statewide Problems			
	Geographic Areas				Geographic Areas			
	Mountains	Piedmont	Coastal Plains	State	Mountains	Piedmont	Coastal Plains	State
A. Types of Enrollees	1.5	3	2	2	1	2.5	7	3
B. Too Many Enrollees Per Teacher	3	2	3	3	3.5	5	3	4
C. Too Many High School Classes	6	11	7	9	7.5	12	8	10
D. Lack of Time for Supervising Occupational Experience Programs	1.5	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
E. Lack of Adequate Financial Support	4	4.5	4.5	4	7.5	7	4.3	6
F. Lack of School Administrator Support	9.3	14	14	14	3.5	9.3	10	8
G. Too Many Reports	9.3	6	8.5	7	13	8	13.5	13
H. Lack of State Supervisory Assistance	5	7.5	6	6	9	9.3	12	11
I. Too Many Non-Agriculture Related School Duties	12.5	12	10	12	14	9.3	4.3	7
J. Little Student Interest in Program	7.5	4.5	4.5	5	6	6	9	9
K. Length of Annual Contract	14	13	13	13	10.5	4	4.3	5
L. Vo. Ag. Being Deemphasized	12.5	7.5	8.5	8	5	2.5	2	2
M. Lack of Adequate Equipment	9.3	9	11.5	10	12	13	11	12
N. Lack of Adequate Curricular and/or Teaching Mat.	7.5	10	11.5	11	10.5	14	13.5	14

Suggestions for Solutions

For each problem area they rated in the top three as being serious problems Statewide, teachers were asked to suggest solutions. Suggested solutions to the number one problem (lack of time for supervising occupational experience programs) included: release teacher at 1:30 p.m.; provide time for supervision; enforce guidelines on how an agriculture teacher's time is spent; cut down on number of classes and number of periods; appropriate travel pay; provide more teachers; and provide all vocational agriculture teachers with 12-month contracts.

The following suggestions were among those made for solving the number two problem (vocational agriculture being deemphasized): develop a good public relations program to inform the public; develop activities to get the community more involved; develop stronger vocational agriculture programs; develop a good orientation program; begin encouraging students in the lower grades; provide more publicity on the State level to careers, leadership opportunities, and the importance of agriculture; provide in-service education for administrators and counselors; better inform the State Board of Education; do more and better research on agricultural employment opportunities; and keep vocational agriculture trained teachers in vocational agriculture.

For the number three problem (enrollees not good vocational agriculture prospects), the following ideas were among the solutions suggested: do better counseling; screen students carefully; involve the agriculture teacher in guidance, screening, and selection process; develop a better method for selecting students; provide better informed full-time guidance counselors; provide more and better courses to attract the good students; limit the number of students per class; and require all students to be involved in a supervised occupational experience program.

Principals' Views of Problem Areas

Table 63 summarizes responses of the principals in rank order by geographic area to the questions concerning the seriousness of selected problems both locally and on a Statewide basis.

The three top problems as perceived by the principals on a Statewide basis, and ranked equally, were: (1) types of enrollees; (2) lack of adequate financial support; and (3) vocational agriculture being deemphasized. Their perceptions of the three most serious problems locally were: (1) lack of adequate financial support; (2) enrollees not good vocational agriculture prospects; and a three-way tie for third: lack of time for supervising occupational experience programs; too many reports; and lack of adequate equipment. The Statewide concern that vocational agriculture was being deemphasized was not borne out as a local concern.

There were several contrasts apparent across geographic areas. The lack of adequate equipment was rated as the top problem locally in the Piedmont area and tied for second place in the Coastal Plains but was in a three-way tie for eleventh place in the Mountains. On a Statewide basis, the Coastal Plains principals rated "too many reports" as the number two problem. Principals in the Piedmont

gave it a tie vote for fifth place while the principals in the Mountains rated it a tie for twelfth place.

Table 63. Principals' Rank Order of Moderate-to-Serious Problem Areas in Vocational Agriculture, Local and Statewide, by Geographic Area, N.C., 1977

Problem Areas	Rank Order of Local Problems				Rank Order of Statewide Problems			
	Geographic Area				Geographic Area			
	Mountains	Piedmont	Coastal Plains	State	Mountains	Piedmont	Coastal Plains	State
A. Types of Enrollees	1	5	4.5	2	1	3.5	4	1.3
B. Too Many Enrollees Per Teacher	3.5	7	4.5	2	1	3.5	4	1.3
C. Too Many High School Classes	11.3	11.3	10.5	11.5	7.3	13	14	13
D. Lack of Time For Supervising Occupational Experience Programs	3.5	3.5	6	3.3	4	3.5	6.5	4
E. Lack of Adequate Financial Support	2	2	1	1	2.5	2	1	1.3
F. Lack of School Administrator Support	14	14	14	14	5.5	9.5	11	11
G. Too Many Reports	9	3.5	2.5	3.3	12.5	5.5	2	5.5
H. Lack of State Supervisory Assistance	11.3	11.3	10.5	11.5	14	14	12.5	14
I. Too Many Non-Agriculture Related School Duties	10	11.3	13	13	10.5	10.5	12.5	12
J. Little Student Interest in Program	7.5	6	7.5	7	10.5	7.5	8.5	8.5
K. Length of Annual Contract	5.5	9.5	12	10	7.3	7.5	10	8.5
L. Vo. Ag. Being Deemphasized	5.5	9.5	9	9	2.5	1	5	1.3
M. Lack of Adequate Equipment	11.3	1	2.5	3.3	7.3	5.5	3	5.5
N. Lack of Adequate Curricular and/or Teaching Materials	7.5	8	7.5	8	12.5	9	8.5	10

Suggestions for Solutions

Principals were requested to suggest solutions for each of the three top problems Statewide as perceived by them.

Among the solutions suggested for the problem, "types of enrollees," were the following: better recruitment programs; better screening and guidance; establish criteria for screening enrollees; redirect objectives; objectives and goals should be harder to reach; remove enrollment requirements; stop putting lower academic students in vocational agriculture; and provide challenging, qualitative programs that will always be dynamic.

For the problem, "lack of adequate financial support," the suggestions included: increased allocations for materials, part-time teachers, equipment, supplies, and consultants; more funding at State level and earmarked for local use; motivate more local support; increase teacher allotments; hope the economy gets better; and show people responsible for giving financial support the results of a good program.

Suggestions for solutions to the problem, "vocational agriculture being deemphasized," included: offer broader selection of courses; encourage student participation and enrollment; adjust program (from farming aspect) to needs of current students, i.e. marketing; put on a public relations campaign; place more emphasis on agriculture related courses; provide more emphasis from the State level; make vocational agriculture more attractive; deemphasize college preparatory; and develop community education type programs.

Comparison of Teachers' Views with Principals' Views

Table 64 provides a rank-order comparison of teachers' and principals' views of moderate to serious problems both locally and Statewide. There was a high degree of general agreement between the principals' and teachers' views of the most serious problems locally. However, a few rather wide discrepancies should be noted. On locally serious problems, teachers were more concerned than principals regarding too many enrollees per teacher, lack of State supervisory assistance, too many high school classes, and lack of time for supervising occupational experience programs. Principals were more concerned than teachers about lack of adequate financial support, too many reports, length of annual contract, lack of adequate equipment and lack of curricular and/or teaching materials.

On moderate to serious problems Statewide, teachers were considerably more concerned than principals with the problems of too many non-agriculture related school duties and length of the annual contract. Principals were considerably more concerned than teachers with lack of adequate financial support, too many reports, lack of adequate equipment, and lack of adequate curricular and/or teaching materials.

Table 64. A Rank-Order Comparison of the Teachers vs. Principals Viewpoints of Moderate-to-Serious Problem Areas, Local and Statewide, N.C., 1977

Problem Areas	Local		Statewide	
	Teachers	Principals	Teachers	Principals
A. Types of Enrollees	2	2	3	1.3
B. Too Many Enrollees Per Teacher	3	6	4	7
C. Too Many High School Classes	9	11.5	10	13
D. Lack of Time for Supervising Occupational Experience Programs	1	3.3	1	4
E. Lack of Adequate Financial Support	4	1	6	1.3
F. Lack of School Administrator Support	14	14	8	11
G. Too Many Reports	7	3.3	13	5.5
H. Lack of State Supervisory Assistance	6	11.5	11	14
I. Too Many Non-Agriculture Related School Duties	12	13	7	12
J. Little Student Interest in Program	5	7	9	8.5
K. Length of Annual Contract	13	10	5	8.5
L. Vo. Ag. Being Deemphasized	8	9	2	1.3
M. Lack of Adequate Equipment	10	3.3	12	5.5
N. Lack of Adequate Curricular and/or Teaching Materials	11	8	14	10

Barriers to Improvement as Seen by Vocational Agriculture Teachers

Related to questions concerning the viewpoints regarding moderate to serious problems in local school communities and Statewide was a question calling for the selection (from a given list of 13) of the three most serious barriers "to further improvement of the vocational agriculture program in your school." Again, both teachers and principals were requested to make such selections.

Table 65 shows the barriers ordered according to the number of times selected by the teachers. Geographic comparisons can be made from data in the table.

The three most serious barriers Statewide, according to the teachers, were: too many students, lack of plant-space-housing, and lack of student interest.

The top rated barriers in the Mountains were too many students and lack of student interest. In the Piedmont and the Coastal Plains the top ones were the same (and in the same order) as the top three barriers Statewide.

Table 65. Teachers' Selections of Three Most Serious Barriers to Further Improvement of the Vocational Agriculture Program, N.C., 1977

Barriers	Geographic Area						State		
	Mountains		Piedmont		Coastal Plains				
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Rank
1. Too Many Students	12	57.1	23	50.0	29	52.7	64	52.5	1
2. Lack of Plant-Space-Housing	7	33.3	21	45.7	27	49.1	55	45.1	2
3. Lack of Student Interest	12	57.1	20	43.5	21	38.2	53	43.4	3
4. Too Few Teachers	8	38.1	13	28.3	14	25.5	35	28.7	4
5. Inadequate Equipment	3	14.3	8	17.4	12	21.8	23	18.9	5.5
6. Length of Annual Contract	2	9.5	10	21.7	11	20.0	23	18.9	5.5
7. Inadequate Teaching Materials	3	14.3	10	21.7	9	16.4	22	18.0	7
8. Inadequate Supplies	3	14.3	6	13.0	12	21.8	21	17.2	8
9. Pre-Vocational Education Emphasis	6	28.6	8	17.4	6	11.1	20	16.5	9
10. Lack of Administrative Support	4	19.1	6	13.0	8	14.6	18	14.8	10
11. Outdated Curriculum	1	4.8	1	2.2	4	7.3	6	4.9	11
12. Lack of Teacher Interest	0	0	3	6.5	2	3.6	5	4.1	12
13. Lack of Community Support	0	0	2	4.4	2	3.6	4	3.3	13

Program Improvements

Teachers were requested to make suggestions for improving vocational agriculture programs (1) at the State level, (2) at the administrative unit level, and (3) at the school level. They were also asked to list specific plans they had for improving the vocational agriculture programs in their schools over the next three years.

State Level

The two most often mentioned suggestions for improving vocational agriculture at the State level were (1) more visits from supervisors, and (2) in-service training. A few teachers suggested better public relations, move back to district supervisors, and more emphasis on teacher education. Other suggestions included: enlarge State staff; enforce guidelines already set; move to standard curricula; more emphasis on F.F.A.; better funding; better communications to teachers; monthly group meetings; and more clearly define objectives of the program.

Administrative Unit Level

At this level the teachers listed closer supervision, in-service education, better public relations, and more travel funds as the key suggestions. Others included: get local planner or full-time local director; put more emphasis on supervised occupational experience; more time for vocational agriculture duties; provide more classroom space; provide training for administrators; more support for the F.F.A.; more funds; and provide 12 months contracts.

School Level

At the local school level teachers suggested the need for better shop and laboratory facilities, better trained vocational guidance counselors, reduction of non-teaching assignments, smaller classes, addition of more teachers, and better screening of potential enrollees. A few teachers also wanted more equipment, better organization, travel funds, parental support, better facilities, more materials, better scheduling, and better public relations.

Specific Plans for Improvement

A rather large number of the teachers had specific plans for improving local vocational agriculture programs over the next three years by (1) changing and upgrading courses, (2) improving the F.F.A., or (3) developing better supervised occupational experience programs.

Additional suggestions included: get better equipment, organize advisory council, more student visitations, community relations program, better screening of students, improve reference materials, initiate summer program for freshmen, work toward masters degree, do a better job in the classroom, and retire "and allow them to hire a younger teacher with more ambition."

PART III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This study was designed to examine the changing roles of teachers of vocational agriculture and evaluate the current status of programs as a basis for making recommendations concerning the role of vocational agriculture in public school education during the next decade.

The major objectives guiding the direction of the study are summarized as follows:

(1) To identify, document, and analyze trends in vocational agriculture in North Carolina.

(2) To identify and document problem areas in current vocational agriculture programs.

(3) To establish the current picture and a data base for future studies by documenting the present status of vocational agriculture education in the State.

(4) To evaluate program results in terms of types of occupations program graduates enter and leadership roles played by graduates.

(5) To examine the changing leadership roles in the local community of teachers of vocational agriculture.

(6) To generate possible solutions to the problems identified.

Data were collected using a structured interview of vocational agriculture teachers and administrators in schools selected through a stratified random sampling procedure. Interviewers were selected from eight universities across the State, provided special training sessions and hired to do the actual interviewing. An instrument containing the questions and room to record responses and an interview guide were developed to assist the interviewers.

The interviews were set up by telephone by the project staff. Teachers drawn in the sampling process totaled 127. Upon calling, it was found that only 124 were still teaching. Of these, 122 (or 98.4 percent), agreed to and actually participated in the interviews.

Summary of Findings. The following statements summarize some of the general findings from the study.

The Teachers. Almost all vocational agriculture teachers in the sample were male. Just over two-thirds were white, slightly less than one-third were black, and fewer than one percent were Indian. Their average age was 44 years.

Over 95 percent of the teachers held baccalaureate degrees, though one-sixth of them did not become certified to teach through the traditional route of a baccalaureate degree in Agricultural Education. Forty percent of the teachers had earned masters degrees.

The average number of years of vocational agriculture teaching experience was 17.16. But, over one-third of the teachers had taught vocational agriculture fewer than 10 years. One-fourth had experience in non-agriculturally related jobs since completion of the baccalaureate degree; over one-third had worked in agriculturally related but non-school connected jobs.

Over one-fourth of the teachers had annual contracts of less than 12 months. The average length of contracts decreased slightly between 1971-72 and 1976-77. Explanations for the change included: (1) de-emphasis by local administration, and (2) moving man-months to other types of vocational education.

Few teachers taught students in grades 7-9 only. However, over one-half taught in grades 10-12 only.

The five-year trend for teachers was clearly toward longer "at-school" time each day with less time available for supervision of occupational experience programs and working with adults. In 1971-72 almost one-half the teachers were able to leave the school facility by 2:00 p.m. In 1976-77, two-thirds indicated their inability to leave prior to 3:00 p.m. "In-school" responsibilities of vocational agriculture teachers increased for one-fifth of the teachers between 1971-72 and 1976-77; they decreased for one-tenth of the teachers.

Teacher morale decreased during the five-year period prior to 1976-77. Yet, seven-eighths of the respondents rated their degree of satisfaction as a vocational agriculture teacher as "satisfied" or "highly satisfied." And, ninety percent of the teachers would recommend teaching vocational agriculture as a possible occupation to students in their schools.

One-third of the teachers indicated they planned to leave teaching within five years; one-half did not plan to continue teaching beyond ten years; and 70 percent expected to have left teaching within 15 years.

The Principals. Practically all the principals participating in the study were male and white. Their average age was 44 years. They had averaged less than one year of work experience in a non-school setting since receiving the baccalaureate degree. They had an average of 13.2 years as teachers, 1.2 years of school work not as teacher or principal, and 6.6 years as principal.

The Vocational Agriculture Enrollees. An average of 136.6 students per school were enrolled in vocational agriculture in 1976-77, up from 115.7 in 1971-72. Two-thirds of the enrollees in 1976-77 were white; three-fifths of the 1971-72 enrollees were white. The percentage of vocational agriculture enrollees who were female increased from 9 percent to 18 percent between 1971-72 and 1976-77. The percentage of the enrollees who lived in urban areas also increased. Teachers reported that enrollees in 1976-77 were better prepared for gainful occupations in agriculture than were the enrollees of 1971-72. They also reported that enrollees had higher interest levels.

The largest numbers of female enrollees were in the course areas of Ornamental Horticulture and Agricultural Resources.

The Program. Substantial changes were noted between 1971-72 and 1976-77 in course offerings, adult education, and supervised occupational experiences and home visits. Changes in emphasis on Future Farmers of America activities were less dramatic.

a. Secondary School Course Offerings. Nearly forty percent of the course offerings in 1976-77 were exploratory or introductory. Seventy-five percent of the teaching time was given to just four courses: Introduction to Agriculture, Agricultural Science and Mechanics, Agricultural Mechanics, and Ornamental Horticulture. Course areas declining in emphasis between 1971-72 and 1976-77 included Crop Production, Agricultural Construction, and Farm Management. However, teachers expressed both a need for and a desire to teach Crop Production and Farm Management. An improvement in quality of both course offerings and teaching materials was noted between 1971-72 and 1976-77.

b. Adult Education. Practically all teachers felt that adult farmer education belonged in the public schools' vocational agriculture program. However, only one-third of the teachers reported a regularly organized adult education program in 1976-77. They were giving less emphasis to this phase of the program in 1976-77 than in 1971-72. Over one-half of the teachers thought that technical institutes had assumed major responsibility for adult education in agriculture.

Three-fourths of the teachers would prefer to give more emphasis to adult education. Lack of time appeared to be the major barrier to their doing so.

c. Future Farmers of America. A Future Farmers of America Chapter was included in nearly all vocational agriculture programs represented in the study. However, only two-thirds of the vocational agriculture enrollees were chapter members. This percentage declined between 1971-72 and 1976-77. Approximately one-half the teachers thought the strength of the program had increased, though forty percent would still rate it average or below.

Almost one-fifth of the teachers perceived F.F.A. activities as being "extra-curricular." Over one-third of the teachers thought their principals perceived it as such.

Only about one-half the chapters participated in the camping program or very extensively in the competition for proficiency awards. Four-fifths had participated in one or both of the last two State conventions. Considerably more emphasis was planned for F.F.A. activities in future years.

d. Home Visits and Supervised Occupational Experience. While over one-half the teachers reported visiting students on a regular basis, one-half the students received one or fewer visits per year. And teachers were giving less emphasis to visiting in 1976-77 than in 1971-72. Most teachers (approximately 60 percent) were encouraged by their principals to make visits and most received at least partial reimbursement for travel costs associated with the visits.

Emphasis on supervised occupational experience programs was decreasing, although most teachers intended to give it more emphasis in the future. Only six of each ten students were expected or required to have supervised occupational experience programs. While 90 percent of the teachers spent class time for study of the supervised experience concept, one-third rated the strength of this phase of the program as "weak" or "very weak." Opportunities for supervised occupational experience programs were equal or better in 1977 than in 1972 for students in two-thirds of the schools.

Community Activities and Change. Two-thirds of the teachers held positions of leadership in organized groups (excluding church or political groups) in their local communities. The prestige of the vocational agriculture teacher in the local community changed very little between 1971-72 and 1976-77.

Teachers were not playing a major role in the local communities as either interpreters of their own vocational agriculture programs or of changes in agriculture. The average number of times they were called on in the year preceding the study to interpret their program to organized groups in the local community was 1.4. They had less than one opportunity each to present a program on changes in agriculture.

Problem Areas. Teachers identified the top three Statewide problems in vocational agriculture as: (1) lack of time for supervising occupational experience programs; (2) vocational agriculture being deemphasized; and (3) enrollees not good vocational agriculture prospects. On a local school community basis, the top three problems were: (1) lack of time for supervising occupational experience programs; (2) enrollees not good vocational agriculture prospects; and (3) too many enrollees per teacher.

Principals saw the top three problems Statewide (and gave equal rank to the three) as: (1) types of enrollees; (2) lack of adequate financial support; and (3) vocational agriculture being deemphasized. On a school community basis, principals thought the top problems were: (1) lack of adequate financial support; (2) enrollees not good vocational agriculture prospects; and (3) lack of time for supervising occupational experience programs, too many reports, and lack of adequate equipment (a three way tie).

The three most serious barriers to improving vocational agriculture programs Statewide as seen by the teachers were: too many students, lack of plant-space-housing, and lack of student interest.

Program Improvements. Teachers thought vocational agriculture programs could be improved at the State level by (1) more visits from supervisors and (2) in-service training.

At the Administrative Unit level, teachers wanted: (1) closer supervision; (2) in-service education; (3) better public relations; and (4) more travel funds.

Suggestions made for improvement at the local level included: (1) better shop and laboratory facilities; (2) better trained vocational guidance counselors; (3) reduction of non-teaching assignments; (4) smaller classes; (5) addition of more teachers; and (6) better screening of potential enrollees.

Conclusions

The following general conclusions were drawn from the study:

(1) The vocational agriculture teacher in the public schools of North Carolina is generally male, middle-aged, regularly certified has taught between 15 and 19 years, is satisfied as a vocational agriculture teacher, and plans to leave teaching within 10 years.

(2) Teachers are becoming increasingly less likely to teach only students in grades 7-9.

(3) The average length of the annual contract for vocational agriculture teachers is decreasing.

(4) The length of "at-school" time for a vocational agriculture teacher is rapidly approaching that of all other teachers.

(5) A large number of teachers will need to enter or return to teaching in vocational agriculture within the next 10 years to maintain the present number of teachers.

(6) Vocational agriculture is taught in rather large schools where approximately one-half the students are enrolled in a vocational education program.

(7) Class size is increasing dramatically. Females and students from urban environments account for a major portion of the increase.

(8) A large proportion of teaching time is given to relatively few courses.

(9) The supervised occupational experience and adult education components of the program are weak. The youth organization component (F.F.A.) is average. Teachers see all three components as important and plan to give them increased emphasis in future years.

(10) The average student receives two or fewer visits per year from the teacher.

(11) Teacher morale is becoming lower; prestige of the teacher remains steady.

(12) "In-school" responsibilities of teachers are increasing.

(13) The vocational agriculture teacher is no longer communicating in an organized fashion with the community in either the role of interpreter of agricultural education or of changes in agriculture.

(14) Teachers and programs are being hampered by lack of time, deemphasis being given to the program, and the types of students enrolling in programs.

(15) Teachers want longer contracts, more supervision, more non-school time, more in-service training programs and more time for adult education.

(16) The annual contracts of all vocational agriculture teachers should be for 12 months in order to give attention to supervised occupational experience, adult education, planning and maintenance, and the Future Farmers of America organization.

(17) A stronger program of leadership for and supervision of vocational agriculture programs should be launched from both the State and administrative unit levels.

(18) This study should be replicated at five-year intervals.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A - Copy of Project Proposal

APPENDIX B - Data Collection Instrument

APPENDIX C - Interview Guide

APPENDIX D - List of Interviewers by Institution Represented

APPENDIX E - Appendix Table

APPENDIX A

PROPOSAL TO:	North Carolina State Board of Education
TITLE:	Status of Vocational Agriculture and the Changing Roles of the Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in North Carolina
PROJECT DIRECTOR:	Dr. Joseph R. Clary, Associate Professor and Coordinator Agricultural Education Program Department of Occupational Education School of Education Raleigh, North Carolina 27607
PROJECT ASSOCIATES:	Dr. Selz C. Mayo, Professor and Head Department of Sociology and Anthropology School of Agriculture and Life Sciences North Carolina State University Raleigh, North Carolina 27607
	Dr. A. P. Bell, Professor and Chairman Department of Agricultural Education North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University Greensboro, North Carolina 27411
	Dr. Texton R. Miller, Associate Professor Agricultural Education Program Department of Occupational Education School of Education Raleigh, North Carolina 27607
	Dr. C. Douglas Bryant, Associate Professor Agricultural Education Program Department of Occupational Education School of Education Raleigh, North Carolina 27607
PROJECT PERIOD:	August 5, 1976 - December 31, 1977
AMOUNT OF FUNDS REQUESTED:	$18,298.

Proposal for a Study Entitled:

STATUS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE AND THE CHANGING ROLES OF TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN NORTH CAROLINA

Introduction

During the Spring of 1975, the Executive Committee of the North Carolina Occupational Agriculture Teachers Association, the Agricultural Education Program Unit of the Department of Occupational Education at North Carolina State University, and the Head of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at North Carolina State University conducted a pilot study to examine the changing roles of teachers of vocational agriculture during the past five years. The study included 18 teachers in 18 schools located in 14 counties and the schools were selected on a cluster, random sample basis. A structured interview technique was used to secure data from both teachers and principals.

Some key findings from the pilot study which need examination through a statewide study were:

1) Over 70 percent of the man years of teaching were being given to only four courses.
2) Course offerings and materials had improved in quality during the past five years.
3) Teachers were responsible for either 5 or 6 high school classes each day along with other responsibilities besides teaching and associated chores.
4) Teachers were giving less emphasis to F.F.A. than they did five years ago.

5) Both home visits and supervised practice were receiving less emphasis than in previous years.
6) Only about 1/2 of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture courses during the 1974-75 school year had a supervised occupational experience program.
7) There was no regularly organized adult education program conducted in two-thirds of the schools included in the pilot study.
8) The vocational agriculture teacher was no longer communicating in an organized fashion with the community in either the role of interpreter of agricultural education or in terms of changes in agriculture.
9) Over one-half the teachers thought the prestige of the position of vocational agriculture teacher had decreased during the past five years.
10) Over 70 percent thought that morale had been getting poorer during the past five years.

Since there was no probability sample involved in the pilot study, no generalizations beyond the 18 cases could be made. Also, the limited number of cases in the pilot study sample precluded any sophisticated statistical analysis of the data.

Are the trends identified in the pilot study representative of the whole State? What is the current status of programs? What factors are influencing the trends? What needs to be done to improve programs and program results?

These and similar questions can be answered only through a carefully designed statewide study.

In addition to those involved in conducting the Pilot Study, The Agricultural Education faculty at A. and T. State University, Greensboro, will be actively involved in the proposed study.

Purpose and Objectives

Purpose:

The major purpose of the proposed study is to examine the changing roles of teachers of vocational agriculture and to evaluate the current status of programs as a basis for making recommendations concerning the role of vocational agriculture in public school education during the next decade.

Objectives:

The major objectives which will guide the direction and thrust of the study are:

1) To identify, document, and analyze trends in vocational agriculture education in North Carolina: major components of programs (classroom and laboratory instruction, Future Farmers of America, supervised occupational experience, adult education), roles of teachers, types of students (e.g. sex, race, farm-non-farm), instructional emphases, and program results.
2) To identify and document problem areas in current vocational agriculture programs.
3) To establish the current picture and a data base for future studies by documenting the present status of vocational agriculture education in the State: number of students; types of students; types of programs; characteristics of programs; characteristics of teachers; status of facilities, equipment

and instructional materials.

4) To evaluate program results in terms of types of occupations program graduates enter and leadership roles played by graduates (Note: a descriptive analysis rather than a major follow-up study).

5) To examine the changing leadership roles in the local community of teachers of vocational agriculture.

6) To generate possible solutions to the problems identified in Objective 2:

   a. by determining the perceptions of teachers and local educational administrators toward needed changes to further strengthen programs to meet the purposes and objectives of vocational education in agriculture.

   b. by exploring with leaders of agricultural organizations and agencies at the State and local levels changes needed to further strengthen programs to meet the purposes and objectives of vocational agriculture.

   c. through a series of planned conferences or consultations with key educational and agricultural leaders.

METHODOLOGY

The general methodology to be employed would be a structured interview of vocational agriculture teachers and administrators in schools selected through a random sampling procedure. The interview guide used in the pilot study (referred to in the Introduction) would be revised as a result of that study, items added as needed to secure data

for the expanded statement of objectives in this study and further field tested before final adoption.

The instrument(s) or interview guide(s) to be used in collecting primary data for this study would be developed as follows:

a. Preliminary draft, using interview guide from pilot study with supplement required from added objectives of this study, prepared by Project Director.
b. Review by small committee from North Carolina Occupational Agriculture Teachers Association Executive Committee (at August 1976 Teachers Conference, if possible).
c. Review and revision by Project Staff.
d. Review by the Occupational Education Research Review Panel and selected others external to the Project Staff or to Vocational Agriculture.
e. Field testing.

The instrument(s) will be constructed and data analyzed in such a way as to insure a "two-phased" approach to the study:

1. Establishment and documentation of the problem.
2. Generation of problem solutions.

The sample of schools to determine teachers and administrators to be interviewed would be drawn through an accepted random sampling technique and stratified by major region of the State (mountain, piedmont, and coastal plain).

A minimum of 25 percent of the schools offering vocational agriculture will be included in the sample (or a higher percentage if needed to assure that at least 25 percent of the teachers will be interviewed).

This will likely result in 100-125 interviews being conducted.

Interviews will be conducted by trained interviewers with responses recorded on the interview guide. The data will be coded, punched onto IBM cards, and analyzed by computer. Appropriate parametric statistical methods will be used in the analyses.

Secondary data sources (State Department of Public Instruction records, census data, etc.) would be used to establish supply and demand projections for teachers and supply and demand data for workers in agricultural occupations.

As consultants for the methodological decisions regarding the study, the investigators will rely on the members in the Department of Statistics at North Carolina State University. In addition, the staff of the Occupational Research Unit will be asked to review methodological decisions as necessary.

Uses to be Made of Results of the Study

The results of the study should serve as: (1) a basis for in-depth examination of local vocational agriculture programs by local education agency or school personnel; (2) a basis for recommendations to the State Board of Education; (3) a self-study by the Occupational Agriculture Teachers Association useful in developing its program and professional thrusts; (4) documentation needed by State Agency and Teacher Education personnel in planning and conducting pre-service and in-service activities for teachers; (5) base data for short and long-range program planning; and (6) documentation of need for and possible substance for quality standards for vocational agriculture.

The study should have potential implications for evaluating trends, status and direction in other vocational education program areas. The methodology, processes, instrumentation (format) and analysis techniques should provide a basic research design, exemplary strategies and samples of anticipated results (products) useful for in-depth analyses of other vocational education programs. This would be a major contribution to the research and evaluation efforts in this State.

TENTATIVE TIME TABLE OF MAJOR EVENTS/PRODUCTS:

	Completion Dates
1. Planning Session - Project Staff	August, 1976
2. Planning Conference - Project Director (or Project Staff) and Teacher Representatives (Teachers Conference Pre or Post)	August 10, 1976
3. Development of first draft of interview guide	September 15, 1976
4. Planning Conference - Project Staff with ORU Staff and/or Research Review Panel	September 30, 1976
5. Selection of Graduate Assistant and other Student Assistants	July-September, 1976
6. Planning Conference - Project Staff and Research Review Panel - Review and revision of draft of Interview Guide	September, 1976
7. Selection of Sample	October, 1976
8. Try-out of Preliminary Interview Guide	October 1976
9. Planning Conference-Project Staff-Revision of Interview Guide	November-December, 1976
10. Selection and Training of Interviewers	January-February, 1977
11. Completion of Supply and Demand Analyses	March, 1977
12. Collection of Data (Interviews)	March-May, 1977
13. Analyze Data	May-June, 1977
14. Drafting of Final Report	July-October, 1977
15. Dissemination Activities	November-December, 1977

-Presentation to NCOATA Executive Committee
-Presentation to Agricultural Education Advisory Committee
-Presentation to Joint Staffs - Agricultural Education
-Presentation to Teachers at Summer Conference (Summer, 1977)

16. Project Completion Date: Submission of Final Report, December 31, 1977

BUDGET

I. Instructional Salaries	---	$ None
II. Supportive Salaries	---	$14,500.
Graduate Assistant(s) ($5,400 at the rate of $300. per month for 18 months)		
Student labor and interviewers ($5,000.)		
Project Staff ($4,000) (Faculty employment on project during summer - outside the 9 months academic year employment period)		
III. Employee Benefits (14.95% of EPA and SPA Supportive Salaries) (Retirement and Social Security matching contributions)	---	$598.
IV. Supplies and Materials	---	$500.
V. Equipment	---	None
VI. Contractual Services (Computer, etc.)	---	$200.
VII. Travel and Subsistence (Project Staff, Consultants, Planning Committee, etc.)	---	$1,500.
VIII. Postage, Telephone and Telegraph	---	$200.
IX. Printing & Binding	---	$800.
	TOTAL:	$18,298.

APPENDIX B

STATUS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE AND THE CHANGING ROLES OF THE TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN NORTH CAROLINA

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Occupational Education
(Agricultural Education Unit)

and

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

THE NORTH CAROLINA A. & T. STATE UNIVERSITY

Agricultural Education Department

Interviewer: _____

Date of Interview: _____

Geographic Area: (1) Mountains___ (2) Piedmont___
(3) Coastal Plains___

County: _____

School: _____

Vo. Ag. Teacher Interviewed: _____

Principal Interviewed: _____

SUPPORTED

BY

NORTH CAROLINA OCCUPATIONAL RESEARCH UNIT, STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

ENDORSED

BY

NORTH CAROLINA VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Spring, 1977

For Coding Purposes Only

CARD #01

Columns:

1-2_____
3-4_____
5-9_____
10_____
11-13_____
14-16_____
17-19_____
20-22_____

GUIDE FOR INTERVIEW WITH VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHER

Columns:

PART I. THE TEACHER

Personal Data

1. Sex: (a) Female___; (b) Male___ 23_____

2. Race: (a) Black___; (b) Indian___; (c) White___; (d) Other___ 24_____

3. Age last birthday:_ _ 25-26____

4. Education: A. Highest degree earned: (a) Associate___ (b) Bachelors___ (c) Masters___ (d) Sixth Year___ (e) Doctorate___ 27_____

B. Undergraduate major: (a) Agricultural Education___ (b) Technical Agriculture ___ (c) Forestry___ (d) Other___ 28_____

C. Graduate major (Masters Degree): (a) Agricultural Education___ (b) Technical Agriculture___ (c) Forestry___ (d) Other___ 29_____

D. (Sixth Year): (a) Agricultural Education___ (b) Technical Agriculture ___ (c) Forestry___ (d) Other___ 30_____

E. (Doctors Degree): (a) Agricultural Education___ (b) Technical Agriculture ___ (c) Forestry___ (d) Other___ 31_____

F. Institution granting: Undergraduate Degree_____ 32_____
Masters Degree_____ 33_____
Sixth Year_____ 34_____
Doctors Degree_____ 35_____

5. Present Certificate Rating: (a) Regular "A"_____
(b) Vocational "A"_____
(c) Provisional "A"_____
(d) Regular "G"_____
(e) Vocational "G"_____
(f) Advanced_____
(g) Unsure_____ 36_____

6. Work Experience (after completing undergraduate degree):

(a) Years working in non-agriculture related jobs_____ 37-38____
(b) Years in non-school but agriculture related jobs___ 39-40____
(c) Years in teaching but other than agriculture_____ 41-42____
(d) Total number of years as a vocational agriculture teacher_____ 43-44____
(d) Total number of years as a vocational agriculture teacher in this school (including any school consolidated with or into this school)_____ 45-46____

Columns:

7. Number of months in your 1976-77 school contract_____ 47-50_____

8. Number of years after this school year you plan now to continue teaching vocational agriculture_____ 51-52_____

If above response is 15 or fewer years, why do you anticipate leaving vocational agriculture teaching:

(a) Retirement_____
(b) For health reasons_____
(c) Move into school administration_____
(d) Change to non-school agricultural occupation_____
(e) Go into farming full-time_____
(f) Go into non-agricultural occupation_____
(g) Other (please explain)_____ 53_____

_____

_____

9. I would rate my present (this year) degree of satisfaction as a vocational agriculture teacher as: (a) Highly satisfied___; (b) Satisfied___; (c) Neutral___; (d) Somewhat dissatisfied___; (e) Highly dissatisfied___ 54_____

PART II. THE PROGRAM

Characteristics of the Present Vocational Agriculture Program

Courses in Agriculture Education

1. Types and number of classes taught, number of students and length of classes taught during current school year (1976-77) by the teacher being interviewed.

TYPES OF CLASSES	No. of Classes	Students #M	Students #F	Length of Classes[a]	Columns:
Exploratory Courses					55-61
7006 Int. to Agri.					62-68
7007 Agri. Science & Mechanics					69-74
Skill Dev. Courses					75-80
CARD #02					
a. Ag. Prod. (Total					23-28
7010 Farm Prod.					29-34
7012 Farm Mngt.					35-40
7023 Agri. Chem.					41-46
7040 Crop & Soil Tech.					47-52
7042 Livestock & Poul. Tech.					53-58

[a] 36 weeks - 1
27 weeks but less than 36 weeks - 2
18 weeks but less than 27 weeks - 3
9 weeks but less than 18 weeks - 4
1 week but less than 9 weeks - 5

TYPES OF CLASSES	No. of Classes	Students #M	Students #F	Length of Classes[a]	
B. Ag. Supplies & Services (Total)					59-64
7020 Coop. Ag. Sales & Serv. I					65-70
7021 Ag. Sales & Services II					71-76
7025 Ag. Bus. Op. & Management					CARD #03 Columns: 23-28
C. Ag. Mechanics (Total)					29-34
7030 Ag. Const. I					35-40
7031 Ag. Const. II					41-46
7034 Ag. Machinery & Equip. I					47-52
7035 Ag. Machinery & Equip. II					53-58
D. Agri. Products (Total)					59-64
7027 Ag. Products & Processing I					65-70
7028 Ag. Products & Processing II					71-76
E. Orn. Hort. (Total)					CARD #04 Columns: 23-30
7051 Orn. Hort. I					31-38
7052 Orn. Hort. II					39-44
F. Ag. Resources (Total)					45-52
7060 Outdoor Rec. & Appld. Eco. I					53-60
7061 Outdoor Rec. & Appld. Eco. II					61-66
G. Forestry (Total)					67-74
7070 Gen. Forestry					75-80
7072 Pulpwood Prod.					CARD #05 Columns: 23-28

[a] 36 weeks - 1
27 weeks but less than 36 weeks - 2
18 weeks but less than 27 weeks - 3
9 weeks but less than 18 weeks - 4
1 week but less than 9 weeks - 5

CARD #05

Columns:

TYPES OF CLASSES	No. of Classes	Students #M	Students #F	Length of Classes[a]	
H. Multi-Occupations (Coop.) (Total)					29-34
7017 Coop. AED					35-40
7019 Coop. AED					41-46
I. Other Vo. Ag. Courses not included above					47-54
J. Non-Agri. courses taught by this Vo. Ag. instructor*					55-62

[a]36 weeks - 1
27 weeks but less than 36 weeks - 2
18 weeks but less than 27 weeks - 3
9 weeks but less than 18 weeks - 4
1 week but less than 9 weeks - 5

*List titles of classes taught:

63_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Note to Interviewer: From this point on, ask the questions within a block only to those who were teaching in 1971-72. Ask the questions outside the block to all teachers.

Z. Number of Vocational Agriculture students in this school by race:

1971-72		1976-77	
a. Black	64-66	f. Black	67-69
b. Indian	70-72	g. Indian	73-75
c. White	76-78	h. White	
d. Other		i. Other	
e. TOTAL:		j. TOTAL:	

CARD #06

Columns:

Cannot answer for 1971-72 because:

k. ___ This school has experienced consolidation since 1971-72. 23-25

l. ___ Records not available - not even for good estimates. 26-28

m. ___ Other. Please explain._____ 29-31

_____ 32-34

_____ 35-37

38_____

3. Number of Vocational Agriculture students in this school by sex:

1971-72	1976-77
a. Female___	d. Female___
b. Male___	e. Male___
c. TOTAL:___	f. TOTAL:___

Cannot answer for 1971-72 because:

g. ___This school has experienced consolidation since 1971-72.
h. ___Records not available - not even for good estimates.
i. ___Other. Please explain.___

How do you account for the change(s), if any, over the five year period?

4. Number of Vocational Agriculture students in this school by place of residence:

1971-72	1976-77
a. Urban___	f. Urban___
b. Rural___	g. Rural___
c. Farm___	h. Farm___
d. Non-Farm___	i. Non-Farm___
e. TOTAL:___	j. TOTAL:___

Cannot answer for 1971-72 because:

k. ___This school has experienced consolidation since 1971-72.
l. ___Records not available - not even for good estimates
m. ___Other. Please explain.___

How do you account for the change(s), if any, over the five year period?

39-41____
42-44____
45-47____
48-50____
51-53____
54-56____
57_____
58_____
59-61____
62-64____
65-67____
68-70____
71-73____
74-76____
77-79____
CARD #07
Columns:
23-25____
26-28____
29-31____
32_____
33_____

5. Compared to five years ago, the vocational agriculture enrollment in this school this year has: (1) Increased___; (2) Remained about the same___; (3) Decreased___; (4) Don't know___; (5) Cannot compare (consolidation, etc.)___. 34 _____

6. If you responded to category (1) or (3) in question 5, how do you account for this change?_____

_____

_____

_____ 35 _____

7. The number of months in my contract this year compared to five years ago is: (1) the same___; (2) more___; (3) fewer___ 36 _____

8. If you responded to category (2) or (3) in question 7, how do you account for the change?_____

_____

_____ 37 _____

9. The time of day when I am free to leave the school to work with adults or supervise the students' occupational experience programs is after_____o'clock or from _____ to _____o'clock. 38-40 _____ 41-43 _____ 44-46 _____

10. Five years ago I was free to leave the school to work with adults, supervise the students' occupational experience programs, etc. at _____o'clock. 47-49 _____

11. My present teaching assignment (is in):

a. The exploratory and introductory area(grades 7-9) only:_____
b. Grades 10-12 only:_____
c. Cuts across introductory (grade 9) and advanced areas (grades 10-12)_____ 50 _____

12. Five years ago, my teaching assignment (was in):

a. The exploratory and introductory area (grades 7-9) only_____
b. Grades 10-12 only_____
c. Cut across introductory (grade 9) and advanced areas (grades 10-12)_____ 51 _____

13. How would you characterize the component parts of the vocational agriculture program in this school now (during this present school year)?

a. Teacher(s): Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 52 _____
b. Curriculum: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 53 _____
c. Teaching Practices: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 54 _____
d. F.F.A.: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 55 _____

e. Supervised Practice: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 56

f. Adult Programs: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 57

g. Community Support: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 58

h. Service to Community: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 59

14. Status of Facilties, Equipment, and Instructional Materials

How would you characterize the present status of the vocational agriculture facilities, equipment, and instructional materials in your school?

	Quite Adequate	Generally Adequate	Inadequate	Not Available	
FACILITIES	xx	xx	xx	xx	
Classroom					60
Shop					61
Greenhouse					62
Land Lab.					63
EQUIPMENT	xx	xx	xx	xx	
Furniture (Classroom)					64
Audio-visual					65
Power tools					66
Hand tools					67
Greenhouse equipment					68
Land lab. equipment					69
INST. MATERIALS	xx	xx	xx	xx	
Textbooks					70
Reference Books					71

15. Using the attached list of possible course offerings, please check the course number of the courses, if any, that you (interviewed teacher) have not taught during the last five years. 72-73

a. 7006___	i. 7021___	q. 7051___
b. 7007___	j. 7025___	r. 7052___
c. 7010___	k. 7030___	s. 7060___
d. 7012___	l. 7031___	t. 7061___
e. 7023___	m. 7034___	u. 7070___
f. 7040___	n. 7035___	v. 7072___
g. 7042___	o. 7027___	w. 7017___
h. 7020___	p. 7028___	x. 7019___

16. Please check the course number(s) of the courses, if any, that have not been taught in the school during the past five years:

a. 7006___	i. 7021___	q. 7051___
b. 7007___	j. 7025___	r. 7052___
c. 7010___	k. 7030___	s. 7060___
d. 7012___	l. 7031___	t. 7061___
e. 7023___	m. 7034___	u. 7070___
f. 7040___	n. 7035___	v. 7072___
g. 7042___	o. 7027___	w. 7017___
h. 7020___	p. 7028___	x. 7019___

74-75_____

17. Please check the course number(s) of the courses, if any, that you have not taught but would like to offer:

a. 7006___	i. 7021___	q. 7051___
b. 7007___	j. 7025___	r. 7052___
c. 7010___	k. 7030___	s. 7060___
d. 7012___	l. 7031___	t. 7061___
e. 7023___	m. 7034___	u. 7070___
f. 7040___	n. 7035___	v. 7072___
g. 7042___	o. 7027___	w. 7017___
h. 7020___	p. 7028___	x. 7019___

76-77 _____

18. Please check the course number(s) of the courses, if any, which have not been taught dur ng the past five years which you think should be offered in your school:

a. 7006___	i. 7021___	q. 7051___
b. 7007___	j. 7025___	r. 7052___
c. 7010___	k. 7030___	s. 7060___
d. 7012___	l. 7031___	t. 7061___
e. 7023___	m. 7034___	u. 7070___
f. 7040___	n. 7035___	v. 7072___
g. 7042___	o. 7027___	w. 7017___
h. 7020___	p. 7028___	x. 7019___

78-79 _____

19. Are there courses other than those listed, or areas of work which you think should be taught in Vocational Agriculture in order to meet the needs of your students and the community?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

80_____

CARD #08
Columns:

20. During the past five years (1972-77), have the course offerings and materials taught in your department:

(1) Improved in quality_____
(2) Remained about the same in quality_____
(3) Deteriorated in quality_____

23_____

21. If you responded in either the (1) or (3) category to question 20, to what do you attribute this change?_____ 24 _____

_____

_____

_____

22. If you have taught Vocational Agriculture more than five years, reflect back to the beginning of your career as a Vocational Agriculture teacher. Have course offerings and materials covered: 25 _____

(1) Improved in quality_____
(2) Remained about the same in quality_____
(3) Deteriorated in quality_____

23. If you responded in either the (1) or (3) category to question 22, to what do you attribute this change?_____ 26 _____

_____

_____

_____

24. Compared with students completing vocational agriculture in 1971-72, the students of the current school year are: 27 _____

(1) Less well prepared_____
(2) Similarly prepared_____
(3) Better prepared_____for gainful occupations in agriculture

25. Compared with students enrolled in vocational agriculture in 1971-72, students of the current school year have: 28 _____

(1) Less_____
(2) Similar_____
(3) More interest_____in gainful occupations in agriculture

26. Number of vocational agriculture teachers in this school this year_____. 29 _____

Adult Education

1. Does your (school) have a regularly organized adult education program in agriculture? Yes__ No__ 30 _____

2. If yes, how is it organized? (Briefly describe) 31 _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. If no, please explain why:_____ 32_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Compared to five years ago, do you:

(1) Give more emphasis to adult education_____
(2) Give about the same emphasis to adult education_____ 33_____
(3) Give less emphasis to adult education_____

5. If you responded in category (1) or (3), how do you account for this change:_____ 34_____

_____

_____

6. If you have taught Vo. Ag. for more than five years, think back to the beginning of your career, do you now:

(1) Give more emphasis to adult education_____
(2) Give about the same emphasis to adult education_____
(3) Give less emphasis to adult education_____ 35_____

7. If you responded to category (1) or (3) above, how do you account for this change?_____

_____ 36_____

_____

8. Would you prefer to give more emphasis to adult education? Yes___ No___ 37_____

9. If you responded yes above, what are the barriers?

_____

_____

_____ 38_____

10. If you have a regularly organized adult program in agriculture, how many members are there?_____ 39-41_____

How many of these are fairly regular in attendance? 42-44_____

Number of meetings during the past 12 months?_____ 45-46_____

11. How do these figures compare with five years ago?
How many of these were:

Members five years ago?_____ 47-49_____
How many of these were fairly regular in attendance five years ago?_____ 50-52_____
Number of meetings five years ago_____held during a 12 months period. 53-54_____

12. Should more emphasis be given to adult education by vocational agriculture teachers? Yes___ No___ 55 _____

13. If you answered "yes" to question 12, what barriers if any, keep this from happening? _____ 56 _____

_____

_____

_____

14. Do you have a formal or regularly organized advisory council for vocational agriculture? Yes___ No___ 57 _____

15. If you responded yes above, how is it organized? (describe briefly)_____

_____

_____

_____ 58 _____

16. If you do not have a formal advisory council, do you have an informal one? Yes___ No___ 59 _____

17. If yes, how is it utilized? (briefly describe)_____

_____

_____

_____ 60 _____

18. Do you think that adult education in agriculture has a place in our public high schools? Yes___ No___ 61 _____

Why do you think this?_____

_____

_____ 62 _____

19. Has the Technical Institute in your area assumed the major responsibilities for adult education in agriculture? Yes___ No___ 63 _____

20. a. Do you keep the shop open on a regular basis? Yes___ No___ 64 _____

b. Do you open the shop on a request basis? Yes___ No___ 65 _____

21. If yes, how many individuals use the shop per week during the regular school year_____: Is this: (1) more___ (2) about the same___ or (3) less___ than five years ago? 66-68 _____ 69 _____

22. If you responded to either (1) or (3) above, how do you account for this change?_____

_____

_____ 70 _____

Future Farmers of America (FFA)

1. a. Does this school have an FFA Chapter? Yes__ No__ — 71 _____
   b. If yes, number of members now___, five years ago___ — 72-74 _____ 75-78 _____

CARD #09

2. a. Percent of your Vocational Agriculture students who are and were FFA members? Now___; Five years ago___ — Columns:
   b. If there is not a chapter, what are the barriers? — 23-25 _____ 26-28 _____ 29 _____

_____

_____

_____

3. Do you give more___, about the same___, or less___ time now to FFA activities as compared to five years ago? — 30 _____

4. Do you consider FFA work as an extracurricular activity? Yes___ No___ — 31 _____

5. In your opinion, does the principal consider FFA work as an extracurricular activity? Yes__ No__ — 32 _____

6. Overall, do you consider the FFA program in this school (1) stronger___, (2) about the same___, (3) weaker___ than five years ago? — 33 _____

7. a. Do you have FFA Chapter meetings during the regular school day? Yes__ No__ — 34 _____
   b. After school? Yes__ No___ — 35 _____
   c. At night? Yes__ No__ — 36 _____

8. If you do not have FFA Chapter meetings, why not?

_____

_____

_____ — 37 _____

9. As you think about the future, do you plan to give the FFA program:

   (1) More emphasis___
   (2) About the same emphasis __
   (3) Less emphasis ___ — 38 _____

10. If you responded to category (1) or (3) above, why do you plan to do this?_____

_____

_____

_____ — 39 _____

11. Has your Chapter been represented at a State FFA Convention within the past two years? Yes___ No___ — 40 _____

12. Has your Chapter had a group to attend and participate in a regular camping week at one of the three State FFA Camps within the past two years? Yes___ No___ — 41 _____

13. Has your Chapter had three or more entries in the Proficiency Award Contest either of the past two years? Yes___ No___ 42_____

14. Has your Chapter developed a written program of activities for the current school year? Yes__ No__ 43_____

15. Do you have an FFA alumni Chapter? Yes___ No___ 44_____

16. How important do you feel it is to maintain an FFA Alumni Chapter?

a. Very Important_____
b. Important_____
c. Deserves Little Attention_____
d. Should be Eliminated_____ 45_____

17. Why do you feel this way?_____

_____

_____ 46_____

Supervised Occupation Experience and Home Visits

1. Do you make home visits to your students on a regular basis? Yes___ No___ 47_____

2. If you responded yes above, indicate below the approximate percent of your students who receive:

(1) No visits per year___ 48-50_____
(2) One visit per year___ 51-53_____
(3) Two visits per year___ 54-56_____
(4) Three visits per year___ 57-59_____
(5) Four or more visits per year___ 60-62_____

3. Compared to five years ago, do you give:

(1) More emphasis on home visits___
(2) About the same emphasis___
(3) Less emphasis on home visits___ 63_____

4. If you responded to either (1) or (3) above, how do you account for this change?_____

_____

_____

_____ 64_____

5. When you visit a student, do you try to involve the parent, parents, or guardian (family visit?)

a. Always___
b. Usually___
c. Sometimes___
d. Seldom___
e. Never___ 65_____

6. To what extent does your mileage allowance cover needed visitations to the supervised occupational experience programs of your students?

   a. All___
   b. Most___
   c. Some___
   d. None___ 66_____

7. In your opinion, how does the principal feel about your making home visits?

   a. Encourages you___
   b. Discourages you___
   c. Makes no difference to the principal___ 67_____

8. What percentage of your students do you expect or require to have a supervised occupational experience program?_____ 68-70_____

9. Do you give time and information concerning supervised occupational experience during regular class periods? Yes___ No___ 71_____

10. Compared with five years ago, does supervised occupational experience receive during regular class periods: (1) more emphasis___; (2) about the same emphasis___; (3) less emphasis___. 72_____

11. If you responded to either the (1) or the (3) category above, how do you explain this change?_____

_____

_____ 73_____

CARD #10
Columns:

12. Approximately what number and percentage of your students now have a supervised occupational experience program? (Note: The question deals with the students you teach - do not include those taught by other teachers in a multiple-teacher department)

Grades (1976-77)	# Students Enrolled	With Supervised Prac. Number	Percentage	
9th Grade				23-31_____
10th Grade				32-40_____
11th Grade				41-49_____
12th Grade				50-58_____
Adults				59-67_____
TOTAL:				68-75_____

13. Compared with five years ago, do your students have:

(1) Better opportunities for supervised occupational experience programs___
(2) About the same opportunities___
(3) Fewer opportunities___ 77 _____

14. If you responded to either the (1) or the (3) category in question 12, how do you account for this change?_____

_____

_____ 78 _____

15. As you look ahead during the next five years relative to supervised occupational experience programs, do you plan to give:

(1) More emphasis___
(2) About the same emphasis___
(3) Less emphasis___ 79 _____

16. If you responded to category (1) or (3) above, how do you account for this change?_____

_____

_____ 80 _____

Community Activities and Change

CARD #11
Columns:

1. During the past twelve months, how many times have you been asked to interpret your Vocational Agriculture program to organized groups in your community?_____ 23-24 _____

2. During the past five years, has this number on an annual basis (1) increased___; (2) remained about the same___; (3) decreased___. 25 _____

3. During the past twelve months, how many times have you been asked to present a program on changes in agriculture to organized groups in your community?____ 26-27 _____

4. During the past five years, has this number on an annual basis (1) increased___; (2) remained about the same___; (3) decreased___. 28 _____

5. During the last twelve months, have you taught short courses in the community (ex. garden clubs, etc.)? Yes___ No___ 29 _____

6. During the past five years, have you taught special courses at a Technical Institute? Yes___ No___ 30 _____

7. Are you now, or have you been during the past two years, in positions of leadership in organized groups in the community or county (do not include church organizations or political parties). Yes___ No___ 31 _____

8. If yes to number 7, please complete the following:

Organization	Leadership Position(s)
(1)	
(2)	
(3)	
(4)	
(5)	

32-33 _____

34-35 _____

Other

1. During the past five years, has the prestige of the position of Teacher of Vocational Agriculture in this local community:

   (1) Increased_____
   (2) Remained about the same_____
   (3) Decreased in prestige_____

36 _____

2. Among the Vocational Agriculture teachers with whom you interact fairly frequently, has morale during the past five years been:

   (1) Getting higher_____
   (2) Remaining about the same_____
   (3) Getting poorer_____

37 _____

3. Besides teaching regular Vocational Agriculture classes, what other within school responsibilities do you have (example, homeroom, etc.)?_____

_____

_____

38 _____

4. During the past five years, have your (other than teaching vocational agriculture) school responsibilities

   (1) Increased_____
   (3) Remained the same_____
   (3) Decreased

39 _____

5. If you responded to category (1) or (3) above, how do you account for the change?_____

_____

_____

40 _____

6. Would you recommend to one or more of your students that he or she pursue a career as a teacher of vocational agriculture in North Carolina? Yes__ No__

41 _____

7. Why do you feel this way?_____

_____

_____ 42_____

8. Assuming that you had the authority, what are the three most important changes that you would make in the vocational agriculture program for North Carolina?

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____ 43_____

Instructional Emphases:

1. How would you rate the emphases given to the various instructional areas (listed below) in the present vocational agriculture curriculum in this school?

Crop Production: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 44_____

Livestock Production: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 45_____

Soils: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 46_____

Horticulture: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 47_____

Agricultural Mechanics: Very strong___; Strong___; Average Weak ; Very weak___ 48_____

Agricultural Exploration: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 49_____

Agricultural Construction: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 50_____

Farm Management: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 51_____

Forestry: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 52_____

Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 53_____

2. How would you rage the emphases given to the various instructional areas (listed below) five years ago?

Crop Production: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 54_____

Livestock Production: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 55_____

Soils: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 56_____

Horticulture: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 57_____

Agricultural Mechanics: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 58_____

Agricultural Exploration: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 59_____

Agricultural Construction: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 60_____

Farm Management: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 61_____

Forestry: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 62_____

Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 63_____

3. Of those students enrolled in your vocational agriculture classes this year, approximately what percentage will enroll in vocational agriculture during their whole high school career? (a) for one semester only___; (b) one year___; (c) two years___; (d) three years___ (e) four years___

64-66_____
67-69_____
70-72_____
73-75_____
76-78_____
CARD #12
Columns:

4. Five years ago, approximately what percentage of the vocational agriculture enrollees enrolled for (a) one semester only___; (b) one year___; (c) two years___; (d) three years___; (e) four years___

23-25_____
26-28_____
29-31_____
32-34_____
35-37_____

Time Distribution

If you have a fiscal year contract, how is your time distributed durirg the summer months?

ACTIVITY	Percentage Dist. of Time Summer 1976 %	Five Years Ago %	
(1) Adult Education			38-43_____
(2) Visiting High School Students			44-49_____
(3) Keeping Shop Open			50-55_____
(4) In-Service Ed. & Other Prof. Development			56-61_____
(5) Planning for Next School Year			62-67_____
(6) F.F.A. Activities: Camping; Convention; Leadership Training			68-73_____
(7) Vacation			74-79_____
(8) Other (Specify)			CARD #13
TOTAL:	100	100	Columns: 23-28_____ 29-34_____

PART III. PROBLEM AREAS, PROBLEM SOLUTIONS AND PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

Problems in Vocational Agriculture

1. Listed below are some problems (or problem areas) which have been identified in one or more school systems in North Carolina. For each problem (or problem area) listed, indicate (1) whether you believe it to be a moderate to serious problem to a good vocational agriculture program in this school community and (2) whether you believe it to be a moderate to serious problem statewide.

PROBLEM (OR PROBLEM AREA)	Moderate to Serious Problem in this School Community	Moderate to Serious Problem Statewide	
A. Enrollees not good Vo. Ag. prospects			35 36
B. Too Many Enrollees per Teacher			37 38
C. Too Many High School Classes			39 40
D. Lack of Time for Supervising Occ. Expr. Programs			41 42
E. Lack of Adequate Financial Support			43 44
F. Lack of School Administrator Support			45 46
G. Too Many Reports			47
H. Lack of State Supervisory Assistance			48 49 50
I. Too Many Non-Agric. Related School Duties			51 52
J. Student Interest in Program Lacking			53 54
K. Length of Annual Contract too Short			55 56
L. Vocational Agri. Being Deemphasized			57 58
M. Lack of Adequate Equipment			59 60
N. Lack of Adequate Curricular and/or Teaching Materials			61 62

2. In order, what do you consider the three most serious problems for vocational agriculture statewide from the above list:

   1st most serious_____

   2nd most serious_____

   3rd most serious_____ 63_____

3. What suggestions do you have for solving the 1st most serious problem?_____

   _____

   _____

   _____ 64_____

4. What suggestions do you have for solving the 2nd most serious problem?_____

_____

_____ 65 _____

5. What suggestions do you have for solving the 3rd most serious problem?_____

_____

_____ 66 _____

6. What are the three most serious barriers to further improvement of the vocational agriculture program in your school? (Select from the list below and encircle the letter of each of three chosen):

(a) Lack of plant-space housing	67 _____
(b) Inadequate teaching materials	68 _____
(c) Inadequate equipment	69 _____
(d) Inadequate supplies	70 _____
(e) Too many students	71 _____
(f) Lack of student interest	72 _____
(g) Lack of teacher interest	73 _____
(h) Lack of administrative support	74 _____
(i) Too few teachers	75 _____
(j) Outdated curriculum	76 _____
(k) Lack of community support	77 _____
(l) Length of annual contract	78 _____
(m) Pre-vocational education emphasis	79 _____

CARD #14
Columns:

7. What suggestion(s) do you have for improving the vocational agriculture programs:

a. At the State level (Supervision, teacher education, etc.):_____

_____

_____ 23 _____

b. At the administrative unit level:_____

_____

_____ 24 _____

c. At the school level:_____

_____

_____ 25 _____

8. What specific plans do you have for improving the vocational agriculture program in your school over the next three years?_____

_____

_____ 26 _____

GUIDE FOR INTERVIEW WITH PRINCIPAL
Part I. The Principal

CARD #14
Columns:

Personal Data:

1. Sex: Female____; Male____ 27_____

2. Race: Black__; Indian__; White__; Other__ 28_____

3. Age last birthday:_____ 29-30_____

4. Education: (a) Highest degree earned_____ 31_____

(b) Undergraduate major_____ 32_____

(c) Graduate major (Masters degree)_____ 33_____

(Sixth Year)_____ 34_____

(Doctors degree)_____ 35_____

(d) Institution granting:

(Undergraduate Degree)_____ 36_____

(Masters Degree)_____ 37_____

(Sixth Year)_____ 38_____

(Doctors Degree)_____ 39_____

5. Work Experience (after completing undergraduate degree):

(a) Years working but not in school setting_____ 40-41_____

(b) Total number of years teaching_____ 42-43_____

(c) Total number of years in school in non-teaching and non-principal work_____ 44-45_____

(d) Total number of years as principal at present school_____ 46-47_____

PART II. The School

The School Characteristics:

1. Grades in this school_____ 48-49_____

2. Total school enrollment (all grades)_____ 50-53_____

3. Total enrollment in grades 9,10,11 and/or 12_____ 54-57_____

4. Number of full-time teachers (in grades 9 and above _____ 58-60_____

5. Number of part-time teachers (in grades 9 and above _____ 61-63_____

6. Vocational education programs offered in this school:

   (a) Agriculture_____ 64_____
   (b) Business and/or Office (Vocational)_____ 65_____
   (c) Distributive Education_____ 66_____
   (d) Health_____ 67_____
   (e) Home Economics (Homemaking)_____ 68_____
   (f) Home Economics (Vocational)_____ 69_____
   (g) Trades and Industries_____ 70_____
   (h) Other: (please list, if any)_____ 71_____

(For Trades and Industries programs list specialty areas offered:

_____, _____, _____, _____, _____

7. Approximate percentage of the total male students in this school who are enrolled in a vocational education program_____ 72-74_____

8. Approximate percentage of the total female students in this school who are enrolled in a vocational education program_____ 75-77_____

PART III. The Program

CARD #15
Columns:

Perception of the Vocational Agriculture Program in This School:

1. Do you recognize any major differences between the vocational agriculture program and other educational programs in your school? Yes___ No___ 23_____

2. In your opinion, is an adult education program an integral part of the vocational agriculture teachers job? Yes___ No___ 24_____

3. Do you, in relation to adult education in vocational agriculture, (1) encourage___, (2) discourage___, or (3) feel that it really makes no difference about the development of a program?_____ 25_____

4. In your opinion, is the FFA: (1) an extracurricular activity___or (2) integral part of the total vocational agriculture program_____? 26_____

5. Is supervised occupational experience an integral part of the total learning experience for every vocational agriculture student? Yes___ No___ Don't Know___ 27_____

6. Assuming you had the authority, what are the three most important changes that you would make in the vocational agriculture program for North Carolina?

(1)_____

(2)_____

(3)_____ 28_____

7. Do you forsee the time when the vocational agriculture program will be eliminated from the curriculum of:

(1) This school? Yes___ No___ 29_____

(2) All schools in the State? Yes___ No___ 30_____

8. If yes to either part of question 7, how long do you think it will take for this situation to come about?

(1) This school: Years_____ 31-34_____
(2) North Carolina: Years_____ 35-38_____

9. Would you recommend to one or more of the students in this school that he or she pursue a career as a teacher of vocational agriculture in North Carolina? Yes___ No___ 39_____

10. How would you characterize the component parts of the vocational agriculture program in this school:

Teacher(s): Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 40_____
Curriculum: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 41_____
Teaching Practices: Very Strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 42_____
F.F.A.: Very Strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 43_____
Supervised Occupational Experience Program: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 44_____
Adult Program: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 45_____
Community Support: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 46_____
Service to Community: Very strong___; Strong___; Average___; Weak___; Very weak___ 47_____

PART IV. PROBLEM AREAS

Problems in Vocational Agriculture

1. Listed below are some problems (or problem areas) which have been identified in one or more school systems in North Carolina. For each problem (or problem area) listed, indicate (1) whether you believe it to be a moderate to serious problem to a good Vocational Agriculture program in this school community and (2) whether you believe it to be a moderate to serious problem statewide.

PROBLEM (OR PROBLEM AREA)	Moderate to Serious Problem in this School Community	Moderate to Serious Problem Statewide	
A. Types of Enrollees			48 / 49
B. Too Many Enrollees per teacher			50 / 51
C. Too Many High School Classes			52 / 53
D. Lack of Time for Supervising Occupational Experience Programs			54 / 55
E. Lack of Adequate Financial Support			56 / 57
F. Lack of School Administrator Support			58 / 59
G. Too Many Reports			60 / 61
H. Lack of State Supervisory Assistance			62 / 63
I. Too Many Non-Agriculture Related School Duties			64 / 65
J. Little Student Interest in Program			66 / 67
K. Length of Annual Contract			68 / 69
L. Vo. Ag. Being Deemphasized			70 / 71
M. Lack of Adequate Equipment			72 / 73
N. Lack of Adequate Curricular and/or Teaching Materials			74 / 75

In order, what do you consider the three most serious problems for Vocational agriculture statewide from the above list:

1st most serious:_____

2nd most serious:_____

3rd most serious:_____ 76_____

What suggestions do you have for solutions to these three problems?

For 1st most serious problem:_____

_____

_____ 77_____

For 2nd most serious problem:_____

_____

_____ 78_____

For 3rd most serious problem:_____

_____

_____ 79_____

Study Results:

Would you be interested in receiving a copy of the results of this study when it is completed? Yes___ No___ 80_____

APPENDIX C

STATUS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE AND THE CHANGING ROLES OF THE TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN NORTH CAROLINA

INTERVIEW GUIDE

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Occupational Education
(Agricultural Education Unit)

and

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

THE NORTH CAROLINA A. & T. STATE UNIVERSITY

Agricultural Education Department

Spring 1977

Supported

by

NORTH CAROLINA OCCUPATIONAL RESEARCH UNIT, STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

ENDORSED

by

NORTH CAROLINA VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Spring, 1977

INTERVIEW GUIDE

NOTE: The information contained in the introduction to this interview guide has been taken almost entirely from Chapter III of J. Stacy Adams' Interviewing Procedures, Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1958. None of the material presented may be reproduced or quoted without written permission from the author.

INTRODUCTION TO THE INTERVIEW GUIDE

This interview guide is presented to you in order to help you to feel more at ease and to take a more professional approach during the interviews which you will administer. We believe the following outline will aid you in obtaining more accurate information.

A. Introducing the Survey and Establishing Rapport

When you first meet the respondent, try to create an atmosphere of trust and confidence. First impressions are most important. The respondent should be made to feel that he can answer questions honestly and without fear that you won't like his answers.

1. You must introduce yourself and state the purpose of your call. The respondent should be told: (1) who is conducting the survey; (2) its subject and purpose; (3) how you were chosen as an interviewer; and (4) that all responses will be treated confidentially.

These four points might be covered in the following manner:

(1st point) "Your interview is a part of a survey supported by the North Carolina Occupational Research Unit of the State Board of Education. It is being conducted by the Department of Occupational Education and Sociology and Anthropology of North Carolina State University, and by the Agricultural Education Department of North Carolina A. & T. State University.

(2nd point) "This is a study of the status of Vocational Agriculture and changing roles of the teachers of Vocational Agriculture in North Carolina.

(3rd point) "I got involved when my department head at_____ University was contacted and asked to recommend an interested student.

(4th point) "I would like for you to feel free to answer all questions openly, since your responses will be kept confidential."

2. You must make the respondent feel that the situation is permissive. Be careful to avoid showing signs of approval or disapproval of certain types of answers. We need his "true" answers, not what he thinks we wish to hear.

3. Try to make the respondent feel that the survey and his participation are important. This need not be overdramatized; his attitude will to some extent reflect your own. You might briefly explain that his responses may represent those of many other people who were not selected for the sample. Whether or not this is the case, his feelings are of value.

4. It is best that your clothing and your language have a neutral or average character, so that respondents aren't tempted to "classify" you. This neutrality may help to reduce biased answers.

5. If the respondent is unable to be interviewed at the scheduled time, try to set up another appointment which is suitable to him. A definite time and location should be arranged before departing.

6. You should remain flexible. This is an "interview guide," not a strict set of rules. Be prepared to adapt to varying interview situations.

B. Choosing the Setting for the Interview

1. Conduct the interview in a quiet, comfortable place.

2. Interview the respondent alone, since the presence of another person may influence his answers.

C. Using the Questionnaire

The questionnaire has been carefully designed and pretested to obtain valid and reliable answers. It is the basic tool with which information is obtained, and should be used with the following directions in mind.

1. The questions must be asked precisely as specified on the questionnaire. Remember that other interviewers are interviewing other respondents, and a considerable degree of uniformity is necessary. Rewording must be avoided.

2. The questions must be asked in the order presented on the questionnaire.

3. Every question on the questionnaire must be asked. If you think the question has already been answered, ask it anyway; however, you may precede the question with a remark such as, "You have already said

something about this, but let me ask you. . ." to show that you have been attentive.

4. When a question is not understood or is misinterpreted, it must be repeated, in the same words, not paraphrased. If he still does not understand the question, you should make a note of it, and go on to the next question.

5. The questionnaire must be used informally and with ease. It should be used as precisely as possible, but the respondent should not be made so self-conscious that he gives biased or "don't know" answers.

6. Rapport must be maintained throughout the interview. If this rapport deteriorates at some point, you might need to take time out to strengthen it, perhaps by talking about some unrelated matter for a moment.

D. Using Probes

Probes are devices, usually questions, which elicit information in addition to that given in the first response to a general question.

1. Probes must be used (a) when the response is irrelevant to the question asked, (b) when the answer is unclear, (c) when an answer seems incomplete, and/or (d) when an answer is suspected of being untrue.

Examples are: "Could you tell me more about that?" "Could you explain that a little more?" "I don't quite see what you mean."

2. Probes must not suggest responses. They should be used only to urge the respondent to express more of his own thoughts when this is believed necessary.

E. Closing the Interview

The completed questionnaire should be briefly reviewed while the respondent is still present to make certain that all required information has been obtained and recorded. This is the time to clear up any doubts you have about particular responses, and to obtain answers for questions that might have been skipped.

You should thank the respondent for his participation in the survey and leave him with a feeling that the interview has been a pleasant and interesting experience.

F. Recording Responses

Your goal as the interviewer should be to make the recorded responses as meaningful to the researcher as if he had done the interviewing himself. Following a few general principles will help you to achieve this idea.

1. Responses must be recorded at the time they are made. They are usually distorted if recorded after the interview.

2. The respondent's own words must be recorded.

3. Non-responses must be accounted for in detail. Show the reason why the question wasn't answered.

4. Record in parentheses any probes which you use. We need to know the stimuli which caused a response.

5. Record any significant events which may occur during the course of this interview, such as major interruptions or loss of rapport.

6. Recorded responses must be clearly legible.

7. Before a questionnaire is returned to the researcher, you should check it for completeness, understandability, and legibility.

G. Supplement to Questionnaire

We believe that as your understanding of the questionnaire improves, so will your ability to obtain valid responses. We hope that most of the questions are written clearly so that both you and the respondent understand what information is desired. However, there may be some questions which seem vague or ambiguous to you or to the respondent. For this reason, we have developed the following question-by-question supplement to the questionnaire. Question numbers correspond to those in the questionnaire. (For example, question 2 of Part I. in the supplement attempts to explain question 2 of Part I. in the questionnaire). You should familiarize yourself with the contents of the supplement and keep it for reference during the interviews, should it become necessary.

SUPPLEMENT TO QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE INSTRUMENT

COVER SHEET

(Complete in the presence of the person interviewed)

Interviewer--Write your full name in the space provided.

Date of Interview: Enter the date of the interview in the following order; Month, Day, Year (e.g. March 14, 1977)

Geographic Area: Indicate which geographic region of the State the school in which the teacher being interviewed is located. Use a check (✓) to indicate this. If unsure, leave blank.

County: Write in the name of the County in which the school is located. Use the County even if the school is in a town or city which has a separate school system from the county.

School: Ask the teacher being interviewed to give you the official name of the school. If unsure of the spelling, request help or seek verification of your spelling.

Vo. Ag. Teacher Interviewed: Write in the name of the teacher being interviewed very legibly. Verify the spelling, if necessary with the teacher. Do not misspell the teacher's name. (Note: The interview must be with the designated teacher. No substitutions may be made.)

Principal Interviewed: Write in the name of the principal being interviewed very legibly. Verify the spelling, if necessary, with the principal. Do not misspell the principal's name. (Note: The interview must be with the head principal of the school. There must be no substitutions.)

PART I. THE TEACHER

Personal Data:

Introduce this Part with remarks similar to the following: "The first part of the instrument deals with some items about you. This is important to getting a clear and accurate picture of the vocational agriculture teacher in North Carolina today. Some of the questions have several possible responses. I will read through each question and all the possible responses. When you indicate the most accurate response for you, I will record it in the space provided. I can repeat any question which may not be clear the first time. Remember, the responses are confidential and neither your name nor school will be identified with any response."

"1. Sex: Female or male?"

2. Race: Black, Indian, White or Other?

3. Age on your last birthday? (Note: If the respondent wants to know why this is asked, indicate that part of the study is designed to get at the supply and demand for teachers for the next several years and the number of teachers in various age brackets is important to know in determining this.)

4. Education: Highest degree earned and actually awarded (read list of possibilities)? Check (✓) appropriate space. Then complete all parts of this question dealing with all up to and including that one.

5. Present Certificate Rating: If clarification needed try the following:

(a) Regular "A" -- Bachelor's degree in an Agricultural Education Program including a student teaching experience.

(b) Vocational "A" -- Started teaching on a "Provisional "A" but have earned enough credits to remove the "Provisional."

(c) Provisional "A" -- Bachelor's degree in a technical agriculture or forestry program — did not graduate from an Agricultural Education program.

(d) Regular "G" -- Completed both bachelor's degee and Master's degree in Agricultural Education Program.

(e) Vocational "G" -- Bachelors degree not in Agricultural Education but Masters degree is.

(f) Advanced — Either "Sixth Year" or "Doctorate." If either, write in which (e.g. "Sixth Year").

6. Work Experience: This question is designed to provide a picture of the major work experiences of teachers in the State. Do not include part-time, supplemental or "moonlighting" jobs. Put a response in each blank — do not leave one empty. If the answer is zero or none, enter "0." For items 6 (d) and 6 (e), the number should include the current year. The number of years for 6 (d) and 6 (e) may be overlapping. If all years of vocational agriculture teaching were in the school in which the teacher is now employed, the responses to 6 (d) and 6 (e) would be the same. (Note: 6 (e) may be equal to or fewer than 6 (d) -- it cannot be a higher number.)

7. Months in 1976-77 contract: The response should be between 10 and 12. Record to nearest quarter month (e.g. 10.25, 11.50, or 12.00 months.)

8. Years Planning to Continue Teaching: Emphasize after this year. Responses might range from 0 to 45. Probe, if necessary, to get the respondent to give the answer in a number. For example, if the response is "as long as I can," ask him to estimate how many years that is expected to be.

If response is 15 or fewer years, try to determine the reason behind the possibility of leaving teaching. The reason is important. So, probe for the reason if it is not readily given.

9. Degree of Satisfaction: This is a general rating -- taking everything into account. Ask the teacher to think back over the year and not to let events of the past few weeks overly influence the response -- one way or the other.

PART II. THE PROGRAM

Courses in Agricultural Education

Indicate that this chart is designed to get as clear a picture as possible of the classes and students taught by the respondent so far this year. If in a multiple teacher department, classes taught by the other instructor(s) are not to be included. You as the interviewer must get a very clear picture and you must transmit that clear picture on the interview guide. Write in as many explanatory notes in the margins as are needed. This is one of the most important items of information being sought -- make sure it is accurate.

Go down the chart one course at a time. For example, "Do you teach an "Introduction to Agriculture class -- Course No. 7006? If 'yes,' how many classes (separate periods or separate groups of students?) How many of the students enrolled in this class (or these classes) are male? How many are female? What is the length of this course?" (Record length by code 1-5 from legend at bottom of chart.)

Follow the above procedure for each numbered course. You can add the totals in each section later.

If one or more agriculture courses taught do not match the course numbers and titles as given, include under "1."

Put non-agriculture courses taught under "J" and list the titles of these courses in the spaces provided after the chart. Be sure to complete all parts of "J" if any non-agriculture classes are taught by the person being interviewed.

NOTE TO INTERVIEWER: Beginning at this point, a second major objective of the researchers should be recognized. There still will be a strong emphasis on what is. However, you will note that there enters strong emphasis on what was five years ago, what are the differences between then and now, the direction (and sometimes the intensity) of those differences, and how are the differences to be explained.

2, 3, and 4 Students by Race, Sex and Place of Residence: Make every attempt to get those breakdowns as accurately as possible. These are not to be duplicated counts (meaning that each student is to be counted only once even if the student is enrolled in more than one agriculture course. The TOTALS in each of the three questions should be the same. Very carefully account for any discrepancies.

For question 4, use the following definitions if needed:

Urban: Places of 2,500 inhabitants or more, whether incorporated or not.

Rural Farm: Less than 2,500 inhabitants, and at least $250. worth of agricultural goods are normally sold annually ($50. worth qualifies if farm is 10 acres or more).

Rural Non-Farm: Less than 2,500 inhabitants, and the farm conditions stated above are met.

5 & 6 Change in Enrollment and Reasons: This refers to total vocational agriculture enrollment. This would include enrollment in exploratory and specialty courses if considered agriculture courses. It would not include enrollment in non-agriculture courses even if taught by the agriculture teacher(s). Write in as nearly verbatim as possible the reason(s) given for the change.

7 & 8 Comparison in Length of Contract: The length of contract refers to the number of months per year the teacher is employed to teach vocational agriculture courses, to supervise practice programs, and/or to conduct other agriculture program related activities. The source of funds for salary is not to be considered in answering this question.

9 & 10. Time Free to Leave School: This refers to the normal daily time that the teacher can leave without making special arrangements or getting special permission for a special activity. It deals with what happens on a routine day.

11 & 12. Teaching Assignment: Some agriculture teachers are assigned so that all their teaching is done in the exploratory or introductory areas. The title of such courses would be something like "Introduction to Agriculture," "Fundamentals of Agriculture" or some similar terms. If all the agriculture

courses being taught by the teacher being interviewed are such courses and are offered primarily for students at grades 9 or below, then check "a." If the teacher has no agriculture courses which are introductory in nature or primarily for grades 9 and below and all agriculture courses being taught are primarily 10th, 11th and 12th grades, then check "b." If the teacher has both some introductory and some classes for 10-12 graders, then check "c." Note: Consider only agriculture courses in this question.

13. This question calls for some self-evaluation and the teacher may be a little sensitive. Indicate that the question is asked because it is important to get some feeling for the overall strengths and weaknesses across the State. The teacher may raise questions like, "Compared to whom?" or "Compared to what?" Ask him to do the comparisons based on the average strengths of other vocational agriculture teachers he knows or average strengths of other programs with which he is familiar.

Phase your lead-in somewhat as follows: "The next question asks you to evaluate eight components of the vocational agriculture program in this school and indicate your perception of the strengths of each. You will have five choices for each component: "Very Strong; Strong; Average, Weak; Very Weak." If some parts of a component are at one level of strength and other parts at another level, give us the relative strength taking all parts into consideration."

Now, read each component and the scale (one component at a time and record the response as it is given).

a. Teacher(s). Refers to vocational agriculture teachers. If more than one vocational agriculture teacher in this school, consider all those when arriving at the response.

b. Curriculum. This refers to the subject matter content of the vocational agriculture program. Does it meet the needs? Is it well balanced (as opposed to too specialized)? Does it have good quality?

c. Teaching Practices. Refers to methods used in teaching classroom (lecture, discussion, independent study, projects, etc.), shop and/or laboratory, field trips, etc.

d. F.F.A. How active is the local Chapter? What percentage of the vocational agriculture students are FFA members? Is there a written program of work? Is there participation in contests beyond the chapter level, State Convention, the camping program, etc.?

e. Supervised Practice. This refers to planned educational experiences outside class time, related to the instructional program, and for which supervision is given by the teacher.

f. Adult Program. This refers to organized and scheduled instructional programs for organized groups of out-of-school youth and adults.

g. Community Support. Is there evidence that the community wants and promotes the vocational agriculture program in this school?

h. Service to Community. To what extent are the knowledges and skills of the teacher(s) of vocational agriculture shared in the community?

14. Status of Facilities, Equipment, and Instructional Materials. This question calls for a general evaluation of the adequacy of several items of facilities, equipment, and instructional materials.

Facilities. Adequacy is determined by such things as size (square footage), usefulness for purpose being used, comfort and adaptability to good instruction.

Equipment. Adequacy is determined by type of equipment, appropriateness, general state of repair and usefulness, and quantity in relation to size of classes.

Instructional Materials. Adequacy is determined by both the amount and usefulness of the materials as related to the curriculum being offered and the needs and interests of the students enrolled.

15, 16, 17, and 18. Course Offerings. Hand the teacher being interviewed the sheet listing the names and course numbers of each of the vocational agriculture course numbers for each of the courses recognized by the State Department of Public Instruction. Read each question slowly and give the interviewee time to go through the entire list. If you have any question concerning the accuracy of the recording of the responses, repeat the course numbers you have checked and let the interviewee clear up any discrepancies. Do this after each of the questions if needed; do not wait until all four have been asked.

19. Other Courses or Areas. This question refers to possible courses or areas of work in agriculture not listed on the sheet being used with questions 15-18.

20-25. Comparison of course offerings, materials and students over time. These questions are generally self-explanatory. Be sure, however, to emphasize the subject (items) of the question and the time period to be considered in questions 20, 22, 24, and 25.

26. Number of Teachers. Determine the total number of teachers assigned to this school for one-half or more of their instructional time and who devote one-half or more of their time to teaching vocational agriculture courses. Emphasis is to be c what is now — not last year or even last semester nor what is planned for next year.

Adult Education:

This section is an important one and the questions need to be asked even if the teacher indicates that there is no adult education program in agriculture in the school.

1, 2, and 3. Existence and Organization of Program. These questions deal with a series of classes or activities through which a teacher conducts a planned instructional program with a group (in which the participants are identified as members) of out-of-school youth or adults.

4, 5, 6, 7. Emphasis over Time. In question 4 and 6, "emphasis" refers to the attention and effort given to the adult program in terms of time. The reasons given for questions 5 and 7 are extremely important. Do not rush these. Try to record as accurately as possible in the interviewee's own words.

8. Current Preference on Emphasis. This generally refers to "more time than you are currently giving."

9. Barriers. These are extremely important. Record as accurately as possible.

10. Membership, Attendance, and Number of Meetings. Membership should deal with the names on a formal roll or listing of class members. Fairly regular in attendance means participation in 50 percent or more of the scheduled activities and classes. A 12 months period is used to get an average intensity for a whole year and to compensate for the fact that adult education activities across the State are not evenly distributed during the various seasons.

11. Membership, Attendance, and Number of Meetings Five Years Ago. Membership should deal with the names on a formal roll or listing of class members. Fairly regular in attendance means participation in 50 percent or more of the scheduled activities and classes. A 12 months period is used to get an average intensity for a whole year and to compensate for the fact that adult education activities across the State are not evenly distributed during the various seasons.

12 and 13. Emphasis and Barriers. Question 12 is sort of a philosophical question and refers to the State's vocational agriculture teachers as a group. Any response(s) to question 13 are extremely important. Record with care.

14, 15, 16, 17. Advisory Council. An advisory council is a group of identified individuals who advise the teacher from time to time on program direction, community needs, etc. in the area of agriculture.

18, 19, 20, 21, 22. These are important questions but should present few problems in interpretation or the recording of responses. Be careful to record as accurately as possible.

Future Farmers of America (FFA)

1. FFA Chapter and Members. A FFA chapter is one in which State and National dues have been collected during this school year and these have been transmitted to the State office. Members refers to the actual number of individuals for which dues have been paid this school year. The question deals with the number of members in the total school.

2. Percent Membership Over Time. Emphasis in question 2a is on the relative proportion of the students in vocational agriculture taught by the interviewee who are (and were) FFA members. If there are other vocational agriculture teachers the response is not to include these?

3-12. These are fairly straight-forward questions and should cause little difficulty.

13. Entries in Proficiency Award Contests. Proficiency Award Contests are for individual achievement (usually in a production or management area, (e.g. poultry production; soil and water management) and entry is made on official entry plans.

14. Written Program of Activities. A program of activities is a plan developed annually which includes the activities in which the chapter plans to participate, the specific goals to be reached, and ways and means of reaching them.

15, 16, 17. Alumni Chapters. An alumni chapter is a group of adults who were former FFA members or who have an interest in promoting the aims and goals of FFA and who have been chartered by the State Association.

Supervised Occupational Experience and Home Visits

1. Home Visits. Does the teacher consider home visits to be regular or routine events?
2. Percentages of Students Receiving Visits. Here, you will write in a percentage, for example, 20%, or 0% in each blank. They should add up roughly to 100%.

3. Comparison Over Time. In this question, the teacher is asked to compare his present emphasis on home visits to his emphasis five years ago.
4. Reasons for Change. The teacher is asked to explain why his emphasis has changed over the five year period (if it did change).
5. Parental Involvement in Visits. If clarification is needed, the teacher could be asked whether he informs the parents of his expectations, whether parents are present during teacher-student visits, whether parents' advice is asked, etc.
6. Allowances for Visitation. Are dollars provided to pay costs of travel for home visits?
7. Principal's Attitude Toward Home Visits. We are interested in the teacher's opinion of the principal's attitude toward home visits. Does the principal have a position at all?
8. Expectations for Supervised Occupational Experience Programs. Try to get the teacher to express a percentage of his students who are expected or required to have the program. Answers may range from 0% to 100%.
9. Time for Emphasis on S.O.E. We are interested in whether the teacher is willing to handle matters concerning supervised occupational experience during regular classes, or will he only deal with this at other times.
10. Comparison of Emphasis Over Time. The teacher is asked to compare present emphasis on supervised practice to that of five years ago (some teachers only).
11. Reasons for Change Over Time. If the teacher indicated a change in the question above, what is the reason?
12. Percentage of Students Having S.O.E. Note that the question deals with the teacher's own students only. For the column labeled "Students Enrolled," the teacher should give the number of ninth graders that he teaches. Under "Number," record the number of his ninth graders who have supervised practice programs. The percentage column can be filled in later. The same process should be followed for sophomores, juniors, seniors, and adults (some teachers may teach only one or two grades).
13. Change in S.O.E. Opportunities Over Time. The teacher is expected to give his opinion as to whether opportunities for supervised occupational experience have increased, remained the same, or decreased over the past five years.

14. Reasons for Change Over Time. If a change was indicated in the question above, what reason(s) can the teacher give?

15. Planned Emphasis for Next Five Years. We wish to know about the teacher's future plans for supervised practice. Does he intend to emphasize it more, the same, or less?

16. Reasons for Change. If a change was indicated in question 18, what is the reason given?

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES AND CHANGE

1 and 2. Interpreting Vocational Agriculture Program. These questions refer to a discussion, description, or interpretation of the vocational agriculture program being offered in the local school to one or more groups in the community with an identifiable membership list.

3 and 4. Interpreting Changes in Agriculture. These questions refer to a discussion, description, or interpretation of changes in technical agriculture to one or more groups in the community with an identifiable membership list.

5. Short Courses. Short courses refer to two or more sessions planned around a common topic.

6. Courses at Technical Institute. This question refers to agriculture courses taught by the interviewee at, for, or paid through a technical institute or community college to out-of-school youth or adults.

7 and 8. Leadership Positions. Leadership positions normally refer to holding an office, chairing a standing or major special committee, or being delegated responsibility for carrying out a major activity of the organization.

OTHER

1. Prestige. This refers to the standing or estimation in the eyes of the people. The question refers to the prestige of the position of Teacher of Vocational Agriculture -- not to the prestige of the interviewee.

2. Morale. Morale may be defined as a state of individual psychological well-being based on such factors as a sense of purpose and confidence in the future.

3. Other School Responsibilities. Make a list of these. Refers to specifically assigned duties or activities for which the interviewee is responsible and to which time must be devoted.

4 and 5. Change in Responsibilities. The perceived reasons for any change are important. Record as accurately as possible.

6 and 7. Recommendation to Students. No special instructions needed.

8. Changes. This question refers to changes in the program statewide. The changes or reasons for them need not be based on situations in the local school. This is extremely important. Record as accurately as possible.

INSTRUCTIONAL EMPHASES

1 and 2. Emphasis to Instructional Areas. Emphasis refers to special consideration or stress. It may be reflected in the amount of time given to the area in the vocational agriculture curriculum. You will need to develop each instructional area as a separate question or statement. For example: "Would you rate the emphasis on crop production in the present vocational agriculture curriculum as very strong, strong, average, weak, or very weak?" Do not let the respondents give you a range such as "average to strong." Probe until he indicates to which it is closest.

3. Length of Enrollment. Students enroll in and stay in vocational agriculture programs for varying lengths of time. This question calls for an estimation of percentage by the interviewee. It deals only with his currently enrolled students. The percentages given should add to roughly 100%.

4. Change Over Time. Again, this is an estimate of percentage of students for each time frame and should add up to roughly 100%.

Time Distribution. It may be easier if you will show this chart to the teacher. The estimated percentages must add to 100%.

PART III. PROBLEM AREAS, PROBLEM SOLUTIONS, AND PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

Problems in Vocational Agriculture

1. Problems Chart. Read the introductory statement. Then go down the items in the chart (A-N). Check (✓) those the interviewee believes to be a moderate to serious problem in this school community. Ask the interviewee to think first only in terms of the local school community. After completion of the list for the local school community ask the interviewee now to think about the problems from a statewide standpoint. Then go down the list again and record the responses in the right hand column.

2. Most Serious Problems. Show the list to the teacher being interviewed. Ask him to pick from that list what he considers to be the most serious problem for vocational agriculture statewide. After recording the most serious

problem, ask him to select the second most serious problem (record it) and then the third most serious problem.

3, 4 and 5. Suggestions for Solutions. Ask the interviewee to suggest one or more ways <u>each</u> of the three listed problems could be solved. Record (in the spaces provided) as accurately as possible the exact wording of the suggested solutions.

6. Barriers to Improvement. Ask the interviewee to once again turn his attention to the local school situation. Read the question exactly as stated. Then read (show if necessary) him the list and request him to indicate the three most serious barriers to further improvement of the vocational agriculture program. The order is not important. The list of three (<u>only</u>) is important.

7. Suggestions for Improvement. The question should pose no difficulty. Record responses as accurately as possible. In "b," administrative unit means the county or city board of education and the county or city school staff.

8. Specific Local Plans. The question deals with specific plans already thought through -- not just what <u>should</u> be done.

* * * * * *

Thank the teacher for granting the interview and for his responses to the questions. Indicate that a copy of the summary of the results of the study will be mailed to him (or her) as soon as they are ready.

INTERVIEWING THE PRINCIPAL

Meeting the Principal

Your first task in interviewing the principal is to establish a friendly atmosphere for communication. Try to develop a high degree of rapport so that both of you will be comfortable.

The principal will be interested in who you are, that you are a student at your particular university, and he will of course want to know what your business is with him. Be spontaneous and at ease, but get to the point; he probably has other things to do. Tell him briefly what the research project is all about, who is sponsoring it, and who is doing the research (this is all given on the cover sheet of the questionnaire). Express your appreciation to the principal for his willingness to be interviewed and try to show him that you are interested in what he has to say.

PART I. THE PRINCIPAL

Personal Data

Introduce this Part with remarks similar to the following "The first part of the instrument deals with some items about you. This is important to getting a clear picture of the school and administration in which and under whom a local program of vocational agriculture is conducted. Some of the questions have several possible responses. I will read through each question and all the possible responses. When you indicate the most accurate response for you, I will record it in the space provided. Remember, the responses are confidential and neither your name nor school will be identified with any response."

1. Sex: Female or Male?
2. Race: Black, Indian, White, or Other?
3. Age on your last birthday? We want the age which the respondent has already attained -- not how old he will be soon.
4. Highest degree earned: (write in B.S., B.A., M.A., etc.)
   Undergraduate major: (write in, for example, "Economics")
   Graduate major: (write in the subject area of the degree)
   Institution granting: (for each degree, write in the name of the school or university from which the degree was taken)
5. Work experience: For each blank, fill in the number of years.

(Note that we ask for ONLY that experience after receiving the undergraduate degree).

PART II. THE SCHOOL

1. Grades in the School. Which grades are taught at the school? (1-12, 7-10, 10-12, etc.)
2. Enrollment. How many students are officially enrolled in this school as of this date?
3. Enrollment in Grades Nine and Above. How many students are in grades 9-12 (altogether?) (There is no need to get the number for each grade separately.)
4. Total number only.
5. Total number only.
6. Vocational Programs Offered. Check the programs offered. In the trades and industries blank, check if offered and then list the spaces that follow this question the specialty areas offered such as bricklaying, drafting, etc. Ask if there is an Industrial Cooperative Training program offered. If so, write "I.C.T." in as one of the specialty areas.
7. The principal's estimate of this percentage will be adequate since time is limited. Note that the question does not ask for only those in agricultural programs, but for all vocational education programs. Do not include general business education or industrial arts.
8. Principal's estimate is sufficient. Again, the question relates to the total vocational education program.

PART III. THE PROGRAM

Perception of the Vocational Agriculture Program in this School

1. If there is confusion after asking the question, read it again emphasizing the words "major difference." There could be several differences which the principal considers significant, but don't probe for them.

2. In other words, does the principal normally expect the vocational agriculture teacher to maintain an adult education program as a regular part of his job?

3. Avoid giving the principal the impression that he "should" give a certain answer. We simply want his assessment of the situation.

4. With this question, we hope to find out whether the principal believes F.F.A. is an "extra" or supplementary program to be handled in spare time (extracurricular) or if it is considered to be a major and vital element of the vocational agriculture program (integral part).

5. We wish to know whether or not the principal believes that vocational agriculture should "naturally" include supervised occupational experience for all its students. Or, should the supervised occupational experience be only for those students who want or need it.

6. This question gives the principal a chance to define problems or shortcomings of the vocational agriculture program in N. C., and to submit ideas for change. The suggested changes could pertain to any aspect of the program (the interviewer should make no value judgment whatever concerning suggested changes - simply accept and record the responses). In responding to such open-ended questions, the respondents may have a tendency to ramble and give lengthy answers. You will need to (preferably) have him condense the information, or if you must, shorten it yourself to what you think represents the essence of his answer. It might be helpful to review orally your shortened responses in order to make sure they accurately reflect the essence of the responses.

7. With this question, we are asking the principal's opinion as to whether vocational agriculture may be declining and his perception of the rate of that decline. Ask him to respond for both his school and statewide.

8. If the principal indicated in question 7 that he believes vocational agriculture will be discontinued, how many years does he believe it will take for this to happen? (Write in the number of years). If the principal answered "no" to both parts of question 7, then you should write N/A (not applicable) in both blanks of question 8.

9. This is another way of getting at the attitude of the principal toward vocational agriculture and his perception of the future of the program.

10. We want the principal to rate the various elements of the vocational agriculture program according to whether he thinks each one is very weak, weak, average, strong, or very strong. Make sure the principal understands the five choices he may make; then you can call out each aspect (for example, "curriculum") for him to rate. Place a check in the blank following the choice which he makes (for example, weak ✓).

PART IV. PROBLEM AREAS

Problems in Vocational Agriculture

1. This chart lists 14 possible problem areas which may or may not exist in the principal's local school community. For each of the problem areas (A-N) ask the principal (1) whether the problem is moderate to serious in his school community and (2) whether that problem is moderate to serious statewide, in his opinion. Place a check in the appropriate column if the principal believes the problem is moderate to serious. For each problem (A-N), you may need to record two checks, one check, or no checks.

After the chart is filled in, the principal is asked to list, in order, the three most serious of those 14 problems. There are of course no "right" or "wrong" choices. We want the principal's opinion.

Following are spaces provided to record possible solutions which he thought were most serious. Be sure to match each solution offered to the appropriate problem.

Study Results

Indicate to the Principal that a copy of the summary of the results of the study will be mailed to him/her if he (or she) so desires. Check whether this is desired on the questionnaire.

* * * * * * *

Thank the principal for his kindness in allowing time for the interview and for his responses to the questions.

APPENDIX D

LIST OF INTERVIEWERS BY INSTITUTION REPRESENTED

The A. & T. State University, Greensboro, North Carolina

Johnnie M. Henderson
Victor M. Hunt
Cedric K, Jones
Hilliard Lyons
Ronald E. McLaughlin

Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina

Doug Alford
Gary R. Bradley
Troy A. Drake, Jr.
Mike Vogler

East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina

Phyllis Blalock
Edward Leverne Buck
Mack Thorpe
Charles Van Hoy

Elizabeth City State University, Elizabeth City, North Carolina

Luther D. Banks
Hubert Griffin
Raymond B. Morgan
Clayton C. Peele

North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina

Jill Anderson
Rex Buelin
David L. Ervin
Jeffrey L. Lake
John Mandeville
Dale R. Newport
David W. Oglesby
Landis Phillips
Wanda Jean Strickland

University of North Carolina - Charlotte, Charlotte, North Carolina

Beth Griffith
Emily Stack
Betsy M. Wiles
Stacy M. Williams

Pembroke State University, Pembroke, North Carolina

Bertha L. Carr
Mary E. Cogdell
Sheila Gasque
Ruby N. Smith
Mike Sutton

Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, North Carolina

Eugene W. Kearns
Charles R. Mayberry
Charles S. Woodson

APPENDIX E

Types and Numbers of Classes Taught and Number of Students by Sex for Classes Taught During 1976-77 By Teachers in the Sample

TYPES OF CLASSES	MOUNTAINS			PIEDMONT			COASTAL PLAINS			STATEWIDE		
	No. of Classes	Ave. No. Students Male	Fem.	No. of Classes	Ave. No. Students Male	Fem.	No. of Classes	Ave. No. Students Male	Fem.	No. of Classes	Ave. No. Students Male	Fem.
Exploratory Courses	42	19.8	.2	93	16.9	.8	88	16.5	1.6	223	17.3	1.0
7006 Int. to Agri.	23	21.5	--	61	16.5	.8	59	15.7	2.0	143	17.0	1.1
7007 Agri. Science & Mechanics	19	17.7	.8	32	17.6	.8	28	18.1	.8	80	17.8	.7
Skill Dev. Courses	58	--	--	140	--	--	137	--	--	335	13.7	4.3
A. Ag. Prod. (Total)	13	12.9	.2	9	18.4	2.1	13	17.3	2.5	35	16.0	1.5
7010 Farm Prod.	3	17.8	1.1	3	22.7	--	8	17.8	1.9	14	17.8	1.0
7012 Farm Mngt.	2	12.3	3.3	1	24.0	10.0	--	--	--	3	12.3	3.3
7023 Agri. Chem.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7040 Crop & Soil Tech.	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	16.0	--	2	16.0	--
7042 Livestock & Poul. Tech.	8	15.1	1.8	5	14.8	1.8	3	17.0	5.7	16	15.0	1.8
B. Ag. Supplies & Services (Total)	--	--	--	2	14.5	--	1	12.0	--	3	13.7	--
7020 Coop. Ag. Sales & Serv. I	--	--	--	1	8.0	--	1	12.0	--	2	10.0	--
7021 Ag. Sales & Services II	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7025 Ag. Bus. Op. & Management	--	--	--	1	21.0		--	--	--	1	21.0	--
C. Ag. Mechanics (Total)	19	17.2	.1	41	16.0	.4	45	15.7	1.4	105	16.1	.8
7030 Ag. Const. I	4	16.8	--	10	14.7	.1	11	15.2	1.6	25	15.2	.8
7031 Ag. Const. II	1	20.0	--	2	7.5	3.5	4	15.0	.3	7	13.6	1.1
7034 Ag. Machinery & Equip. I	9	15.8	.1	26	17.1	.4	22	16.3	1.0	57	16.6	.6
7035 Ag. Machinery & Equip. II	5	19.4	--	3	16.0	--	8	15.4	2.6	16	16.8	1.3
D. Agri. Products (Total)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7027 Ag. Products & Processing I	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-
7028 Ag. Products & Processing II	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
E. Orn. Hort. (Total)	18	12.7	4.5	54	11.2	7.7	33	8.4	11.2	105	10.6	8.3
7051 Orn. Hort. I	13	13.1	5.7	41	11.3	8.7	30	8.7	11.0	84	10.7	9.1
7052 Orn. Hort. II	5	11.8	1.4	13	10.8	4.5	3	5.3	13.7	21	10.2	5.1
F. Ag. Resources (Total)	1	9.0	11.0	11	11.6	8.1	23	13.8	5.7	35	12.9	6.6
7060 Outdoor Rec. & Appld. Eco. I	1	9.0	11.0	9	12.1	7.9	19	13.7	6.6	29	13.0	7.1
7061 Outdoor Rec. & Appld. Econ. II	--	--	--	2	9.5	9.0	4	14.0	1.3	6	12.5	3.8
G. Forestry (Total)	6	10.7	1.0	12	17.2	1.8	11	16.4	3.3	29	15.5	2.2
7070 Gen. Forestry	6	10.7	1.0	6	14.8	.5	8	17.4	4.3	20	14.6	2.2
7072 Pulpwood Prod.	--	--	--	6	19.5	3.0	3	13.7	.7	9	17.6	2.2
H. Multi-Occupations (Coop.) (Total)	--	--	--	3	8.7	7.7	3	20.3	.7	6	14.5	4.2
7017 Coop. AED I	--	--	--	2	7.5	7.0	3	20.3	.7	5	15.2	3.2
7019 Coop. AED II	--	--	--	1	11.0	9.0	--	--	--	1	11.0	9.0
I. Other Vo. Ag. Courses not included above	10	9.0	--	8	13.5	5.5	8	12.0	8.4	17	12.5	6.5
Non-Agri. courses taught by this Vo. Ag. instructor*	--	--	--	6	28.0	--	12	22.0	6.0	18	24.0	4.0